LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.
GIFT OF

Class

MEMORANDA OF A RESIDENCE

AT THE

COURT OF LONDON,

COMPRISING INCIDENTS OFFICIAL AND PERSONAL

FROM 1819 TO 1825.

INCLUDING NEGOTIATIONS

ON THE OREGON QUESTION,

AND OTHER UNSETTLED QUESTIONS

BETWEEN THE

UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN.

By RICHARD RUSH,

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY FROM THE UNITED STATES, FROM 1817 TO 1825.

PHILADELPHIA:

LEA & BLANCHARD.

1845.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1845, by

LEA & BLANCHARD,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

64868

CONTENTS.

Page

Introductory Remarks..... 1

CHAPTER I.

Interview with Lord Castlereagh on the affairs of Spanish America. Dinner at the Portuguese Ambassador's, to the Archduke Maximilian of Austria—Relative expense of the British and American Army and Navy..... 13

CHAPTER II.

The Old Bailey, Guildhall, and Doctor's Commons—opinion delivered by Sir William Scott, Judge of the High Court of Admiralty..... 24

CHAPTER III.

Interview with the Marquis of Lansdowne and Mr. Wilberforce on the subject of the Slave Trade—official correspondence with Lord Castlereagh on the subject..... 29

CHAPTER IV.

Weeks's Museum—its extraordinary collection.—Royal Chapel, Whitehall.—Levee at Carlton House—Austrian Court at the Congress of Vienna.—Interview with Lord Castlereagh on Spanish American

67868

affairs and other subjects.—The cases of Arbuthnot and Ambrister to be brought before Parliament.—Dinner at the Marquis of Lansdowne's —Sir James Macintosh.—Vote of the House of Representatives refusing to censure General Jackson.—News of the cession of the Floridas to the United States, arrives in London.—Note to Lord Castlereagh on extra duties charged on vessels of the United States.. 46

CHAPTER V.

Dinner at Prince Esterhazy's.—Remarkable incident at it.—Dinner at Lord Teignmouth's.—Interview with the President of the Board of Trade, relative to the extra duties.—Letter to the Consul of the United States at Liverpool in connexion with this subject.—Dinner at the Spanish Ambassador's.—Motion in the House of Lords on the cases of Arbuthnot and Ambrister.—English Foreign Enlistment Bill.—Party at the Countess of Jersey's; at Countess Grosvenor's... 63

CHAPTER VI.

Autograph Letter from the President to the Prince Regent.—Emigrants from England to the United States.—Dinner at Mr. William Vaughan's.—Dinner at Mr. Inglis's—Mr. Wilberforce—Dr. Johnson. —Dinner at the Spanish Ambassador's.—Levee at Carlton House. —Special Audience of the Prince Regent.—Conversation on American Interests at the Levee..... 82

CHAPTER VII.

Marriages of the Dukes of Cambridge, Clarence and Kent.—Forms between Governments on such occasions.—Drawing Room on the Prince Regent's Birth-day.—Court Forms.—Rumors of Ministerial Changes.—Interview with Lord Castlereagh on the West India Trade. Rumors about Cuba.—Dinner at the Russian Ambassador's.—Prince Regent's Drawing Room.—Dinner at Lord Castlereagh's.—The Rumor about Cuba.—Lord Castlereagh pays a compliment to the United States..... 96

CHAPTER VIII.

Party at Carlton House.—Conversation about Cuba.—Dinner at Mr. George Phillips's.—Dinner at Mr. Trail's.—The Box presented by the Earl of Buchan to General Washington.—Note from Lord Castlereagh on Special Audiences of the Prince Regent.—Dinner at the Duke of Wellington's.—Letter to Mr. Gallatin—Cuba—The Florida Treaty—The West India Trade. Party at Grosvenor House. Arrival of the American Steam-ship Savannah, at Liverpool..... 115

CHAPTER IX.

Visit to Holkham, the estate of Mr. Coke, Norfolk county—The Sheep Shearing. Prorogation of Parliament. Entertainment at Carlton House—Lord Castlereagh speaks of the Florida Treaty—what he afterwards says on that subject, and on the cases of Arbuthnot and Ambrister, at the Austrian Ambassador's..... 132

CHAPTER X.

Order in Council prohibiting the Exportation of Arms to Spain. Party at Prince Leopold's. Letters to Mr. Gallatin, and Colonel Trumbull. Dinner at the Vice Chancellor's. Notice of certain measures of Parliament, amongst them, Mr. Peel's Report on the Currency..... 154

CHAPTER XI.

Entertainment at the French Ambassador's—the Florida Treaty. Brewery of Trueman, Hanbury and Company. Dinner at Lord Castlereagh's, North Cray—American Flying Squirrels and Humming Birds—Anecdote of the Persian Ambassador. Interview with Lord Castlereagh on the West India Trade and other subjects. Mr. Stratford Canning Appointed Minister to the United States. Dinner at Mr. Lyttelton's..... 177

CHAPTER XII.

Dinner at the Traveller's Club. Armaments in aid of the Spanish American cause, Dinner at Baron Fagel's, Ambassador from the Netherlands. Prizes taken by the Spanish Americans, not admitted into English ports. Interview with Lord Castlereagh on the Slave Trade. Official Notes on that subject—and Parliamentary Addresses. 206

CHAPTER XIII.

Number of American Vessels in British Ports. Dinner at the Chancellor of the Exchequer's. Opening of Parliament—an early session called on account of the disturbed state of the country. Levee at Carlton House. Fête at the Spanish Ambassador's—the Horse Guards called out. Duty on Tobacco, Snuff and Hops. Dinner at Mr. Colquhoun's. Interview on official subjects with Lord Castlereagh. England consents to the Emperor of Russia as Umpire under the Disputed Article of the Treaty of Ghent..... 228

CHAPTER XIV.

Death of the Duke of Kent. Death of George the Third. Solemnities and Ceremonies connected with the Demise of the Crown. The Prince Regent ascends the Throne. Dissolution of Parliament determined upon. State of things between the King and Princess of Wales. Interview with Lord Castlereagh—Cato Street Conspiracy. Dinner at the Traveller's Club. Dinner at Mr. Stratford Canning's. Measures of Parliament under the disturbed state of the country. Dinner at Sir Edmund Antrobus's; at Mr. Holland's.... 243

CHAPTER XV.

Dinner at the Marquis of Lansdowne's. Interview with Earl Bathhurst on the subject of presents to the American Indians. Funeral of

Mr. West, President of the Royal Academy. Duels between Naval Officers of the United States and British Officers at Gibraltar.—Interview with the Colonial Secretary of State on this subject. Dinner at the Middle Temple with Mr. George Joy. Dinner at Lord Harrowby's; at Lord Castlereagh's; at Mr. Robinson's..... 275

CHAPTER XVI.

Visit from Mr. Wilberforce—the Slave Trade—Piracy—Impressment. Cato Street Conspiracy—Five of the Conspirators convicted and executed. Droits of the Crown. Dinner at Lord Melville's—death of Commodore Decatur. Visit to the Royal Arsenal at Woolwich. Arrival of the Queen, late Princess of Wales, at Dover. Special audience of the King. Dinner at Prince Leopold's. Dinner at Lord Castlereagh's—Unusual incidents at it. The King's Levee—Conversation with Mr. Canning on the public speaking in the two Houses of Parliament. Dinner at Mr. Canning's,..... 294

CHAPTER XVII.

Interview with Lord Castlereagh on the West India Trade, and other subjects. Umpirage of the Emperor of Russia, under the Disputed Article of the Treaty of Ghent. Dinner at the Duke of Wellington's; at Lord Castlereagh's; at Mr. Planta's; at the Duke of Sussex's. The Dispute between the King and Queen. Revolution in Spain. Course of the British Government in relation to it..... 315

CHAPTER XVIII.

Trial of the Queen. American Vessels bound to French Ports, land their Cargoes in England under the Warehousing System. Continuation of the Queen's Trial.—Mr. Brougham. Dinner at the French Ambassador's at Harrow, in honor of the Birth of the Duke of Bordeaux. Ratification of the Florida Treaty. Dinner at the Spanish Ambassador's. Termination of the Queen's Trial.—London illumi-

nated. Dinner at Mrs. Porter's—Anecdotes of Napoleon. Dinner at the French Ambassador's, Portland Place. Dinner at Mr. Trotter's. Prorogation of Parliament. Letter to Mr. Crawford, Secretary of the Treasury. Parliamentary Report on the Foreign Trade of England. Interview with Lord Castlereagh—Umpirage of the Emperor Alexander under the Treaty of Ghent. Correspondence between the Minister of State at Madrid and the British Ambassador, respecting the Florida Treaty. Party at Prince Esterhazy's..... 336

CHAPTER XIX.

Party at the Russian Ambassador's—Certain duties of British Ambassadors and Ministers—Language of Official Diplomatic Notes. Levee at Carlton Palace—Special Audience of the King to deliver Autograph Letters from the President, on the Death of the Duchess of York, and recall of Sir Charles Bagot from his Mission to Washington. The Coronation. Dinner at the Marquis of Londonderry's, (late Lord Castlereagh.) Fête Champêtre at North Cray, given by the Marchioness of Londonderry in honor of the Coronation. Dinner at the King's. The Duke of Wellington gives a dinner in honor of the Coronation, at which the King is his guest. Ball given by the Duke de Grammont, Special Ambassador from France, in honor of the Coronation, which the King attends..... 368

CHAPTER XX.

Death of the Marquis of Londonderry. The Foreign Ambassadors and Ministers attend his Funeral. Mr. Canning becomes Foreign Secretary of England. Instructions for opening an Extensive Negotiation with England. Interview with Mr. Canning on that subject. Conversation with him on the plans of France and the European Alliance, respecting Spanish America. Relationship of the United States to this subject. Dinner at Mr. Planta's—the Game of Twenty Questions..... 391

CHAPTER XXI.

Communications from Mr. Canning on the Affairs of Spanish America, and steps taken under them. Further instructions on the proposed Negotiation. Further communication from Mr. Canning on the affairs of Spanish America..... 412

CHAPTER XXII.

Full interview with Mr. Canning on the affairs of Spanish America, and report of what passed to the Government of the United States. Further interview on the same subject; and on that of the Negotiation—to the opening of which England accedes. Mr. Huskisson and Mr. Stratford Canning to be the British Negotiators. Renewed interview with Mr. Canning on the affairs of Spanish America, and Report of what passed..... 428

CHAPTER XXIII.

Course of the United States in regard to Spanish America. Declarations of President Monroe in his Message to Congress, December, 1823, respecting the new states of Spanish America, and non-colonization on the American Continents. Their reception in Europe. Dinner at the Duke of Sussex's; at Mr. Canning's. Interview with Mr. Canning on the subject of the approaching negotiation; North West Coast of America (Oregon Territory), the prominent topic. Another interview with Mr. Canning; North West Coast again the topic. England objects to the principle of non-colonization, taken in the President's Message. Interview with Mr. Canning preparatory to opening the Negotiation..... 455

CHAPTER XXIV.

The general negotiation opens. Subject of the Slave Trade first taken up. Dinner at the Duke of Sussex's; at Mr. Stratford Canning's. Renewed interview with Mr. Secretary Canning, on the

affairs of Spanish America. Second meeting of the Plenipotentiaries on the business of the Negotiation. Interview with the Deputies from Greece. Third meeting of the Plenipotentiaries; West India and Colonial Trade—Navigation of the St. Lawrence. Dinner at Prince Polignac's, the French Ambassador. Fourth meeting of the Plenipotentiaries. Dinner at the Marquis of Lansdowne's; at the Duke of Wellington's; at Mr. Peel's. Fifth, sixth and seventh meetings of the Plenipotentiaries. Convention relative to the Slave Trade finally agreed upon and signed. Its partial ratification by the Senate, and history of its ultimate defeat..... 475

CHAPTER XXV.

The negotiation proceeds under its other heads. Characteristics of these, including unsettled Maritime Questions—Privateering—Impressment—and the Oregon Question. Final Report to the Government of the United States on the course and termination of the whole Negotiation. Oregon Question, then first discussed at large between the two nations. Conflicting views of each stated..... 502

CHAPTER XXVI.

Levee at Carlton Palace. Inform Mr. Canning of my recall, and ask an interview with the King; a time for which is appointed. The Mission closes with an audience of leave of the King..... 638

ERRATA.

Page 25, line third, second paragraph, for *description*, read *inscription*.
" 55, eighth line from the top, insert *and* before *his*.
" 105, third line, third paragraph, instead of *with*, read *between*.
" 118, fourth line, second paragraph, read *Cumberland's* for *Cumberland*.
" 147, fourth line, first paragraph, for *Shearing*, read *Shearings*.
" 157, read *Erving*, for *Exing*—in foot note.
" 190, eighth line from the bottom, for *unrestrained*, read *unconstrained*.
" 195, third line from the top, for *America*, read *American*.
" 243, ninth line from the bottom, for Sir *Edward*, read Sir *Edmund*.
" 352, strike out letter I, end of ninth line from the bottom.
" 397, fourth line from the bottom, insert *day*, after *that*.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

PLAN AND OBJECT OF THE WORK.

In the spring of 1833, when I threw out a volume of the same general nature with this, I intimated doubts whether the work would be continued; and as twelve years have elapsed without a continuation of it, whilst the materials have been in my possession, it may be inferred that those doubts were sincere. I had objections to going on with a work of this description, unless under the possible hope of some public good resulting from it.

But of late, the relations between the United States and England, although happily pacific, have been assuming, in some respects, an aspect less and

less friendly; I do not mean as indicated by any of the official correspondence or steps between the two governments, of which I know too little to speak, but as manifested by public opinion, and the press, in both countries. International questions of importance to both, have been advancing to a point, and producing public discussions in both, under feelings inauspicious to either nation doing justice to the other. The Oregon question is one of them; and, at the present juncture, the most important. I have therefore been induced to publish an account of negotiations, in connexion with contemporary and explanatory matter belonging to them, which I conducted with England, over and above those described in the former volume, including the whole subject of the Oregon; and if by doing so, I may be able to contribute a mite towards awakening dispositions to calmer inquiry on both sides of the water, I should consider myself truly fortunate. I desire to pour oil on angry waves which seem beginning to heave; and however little may be in my power in this respect, the motive has strengthened me in the task undertaken.

Continuing the work at all, I continue it on the plan commenced. I intermingle social and personal scenes with those that are official, and for the same reasons as before. These were given in the remarks "To the Reader," in the former volume; and especially also in the preface to the second edition of it published in Philadelphia, July, 1833, and need not here be repeated. I keep within the same limits, and lay myself under all the restraints, established in that volume. In this volume there is rather more both of official and personal matter; and I have also introduced a little more of the miscellaneous matter of the times, as these are now growing to be, in some degree, historical. If this kind of companionship to the negotiations, should gain for the latter any better chance of being read than they would otherwise ever be likely to have, the knowledge of them might possibly have some tendency to place two great and kindred nations in truer lights towards each other.

The power, intelligence, and high fashion of the world, are in favor of peace. The King of the French pays a visit to the Queen of England, to

foster this beneficent spirit; towards which the Queen had led the way, by first going to Eu. The Emperor of Russia also pays a visit to the English Queen, "even at a great sacrifice of private convenience." The Queen, in her speech to Parliament from which these last words are taken, cordially acknowledges both visits, in the spirit congenial to that which dictated them. Shall Republican America, shall this great and rising nation of the New World, be behind Europe in fostering this beneficent spirit? Will England, when she comes fully to weigh the immense value of friendly relations with this country, be less anxious to maintain them, than with the dominions of these royal and imperial visitors to her shores? It cannot be, that either country will be insensible to a duty so precious. The King of the French is reported to have said, in reply to an address at Portsmouth, on the occasion of his visit to Queen Victoria, that he looked upon the friendship of France and England, "*as the Keystone of the arch which supported the peace of the world.*" Let the peace between the United States

and England be broken, and who does not see that the arch would, as certainly, tumble to pieces.

Far off be that calamity. With the reflecting mind, with the calm wisdom, of which the present Premier of Britain has given such frequent proofs, and the wisdom which will guide the counsels of the United States, a rupture between the two nations is surely not to be anticipated; against which their own highest interests and the interests of the world at large, so powerfully plead. General Jackson, whilst President, had always a sincere desire to be at peace with England. In his annual message to Congress in December 1832, speaking of the good understanding which it was the interest of both parties to preserve inviolate, he strikingly characterised it as "CEMENTED BY A COMMUNITY OF LANGUAGE, MANNERS AND SOCIAL HABITS; AND BY THE HIGH OBLIGATIONS WE OWE TO OUR BRITISH ANCESTORS FOR MANY OF OUR MOST VALUABLE INSTITUTIONS, AND FOR THAT SYSTEM OF REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT WHICH HAS ENABLED US TO PRESERVE AND IMPROVE THEM." It is well known, that that

gallant warrior was in favor of settling the dispute respecting the north eastern boundary, by accepting the compromise award of the King of Holland, although the Senate was against it; and although it had been repeatedly declared, at popular meetings and in our legislative bodies, that our title was complete to the whole of "the disputed territory." The London Quarterly Review for March 1843, called General Jackson "a man of resolution and sagacity;" and, alluding to his "anxious desire and laudable ambition," these are the words of the Review, to settle the above boundary question, remarked, that as he had "in former days gallantly defeated us [the English] in the field, he was stronger in public opinion than any other statesman would have been for doing us justice in the cabinet."

Whilst we all feel confident that the present executive head of our happy Union will "*submit to nothing that is wrong*" from Britain, (and what American can ever for a moment desire that he should?) we may feel alike confident, that, adopting the remaining part of the noble maxim of his illus-

trious predecessor and friend, General Jackson, he will "ask nothing that is not right."

In reference to the social scenes recorded in this volume, it may be pardonable if I should, at this point of time, say a word or two founded on the experience of the past. I will simply then remark, that in the pages of the former volume, more than one hundred names are mentioned; and coupled with most of them, portions of conversations were given, and allusions made to private life in the mansions and circles of England which I frequented. Nevertheless, although the book has been so many years before the public, no complaint has ever reached me, directly or indirectly, from any one of those sources; from which I infer that the guards I imposed upon myself were considered ample, as I intended they should be; and I am not without other and gratifying testimonials of a more direct nature, that these allusions to private life were not considered objectionable. If, in going on with them, similar guards were not kept up in this volume, it should never go to the press. I have been to

England since the publication of the former volume, and had renewed intercourse with individuals and families mentioned in it; and I cannot here refrain from saying, that, but for the entire chasm of more than two years which occurs in the present volume, and the paramount and absorbing nature of the negotiations filling its latter pages, names which do not appear in them would have found a place, merely for the satisfaction of expressing my feelings under kind hospitalities and other marks of friendliness received. Sir George Staunton, Mr. Guillemard, the Duke of Somerset, Sir Alexander Johnston, Mr. Henry St. George Tucker, Mr. Basil Cochrane, the late Earl of Morton, and the Buller family, Countess Mengden, Sir Coutts Trotter, the late Earl of Clarendon—these are some of the names not absent from my grateful recollections.

Nor has the substantial fidelity of the former volume in other respects, been impaired, and my great aim has naturally been to impart to the present, the same character for truth; which alone can compen-

sate for the defects and imperfections in both volumes. A single page in a great author, humbles me to the dust—under all views of authorship. If Horace Walpole somewhere says this, tenfold need have I to say and feel it. Some inadvertencies in things little material, found their way into the former volume; but I am justified in saying that the sum of them does not trench upon that essential authenticity, which is the sole merit I aspire to for the work, in its official or personal parts; and it may be proper I should say, as formerly, that I publish nothing official, whether it occurred in writing or orally, not heretofore made public by the Government of the United States in detached ways and at different periods of time—where not given out in full and regular connexion.

In the present volume, I have perhaps been more minute in some of the scenes than before; but it has been remarked that "even minute things where they concern great characters, seem to quit their nature and become things of consequence, besides that they bring us nearer to the times and persons they

describe." Being farther off now from the times and persons described than when I ventured upon the former volume, I must hope for the shield of this remark if ever going into a little more detail in parts purporting to be at all descriptive.

I have written in the unchanged tone of good feel ing towards England and her great names which characterized the former volume, and which I desire to cherish as long as we can honorably keep at peace; never supposing that this feeling may not be cherished in subordination to that primary and constant love for his own land, which every American must ever feel, and glory in feeling. Who looks therefore in these limited pages, for an array of the disparaging things in part composing the mighty aggregate of good and evil in the national character and condition of England, like Shakspeare's "mingled yarn" in the life of man, will not find them. Moreover, they are so abundantly promulgated by the self-accusing portion of her own free press, and the searching self-examinations of her parliamentary committees, which probe and blazon them in the hope of working out meliorations from age to age, and

they are so fully repeated by writers in other countries, that their omission from a single book, if only as novelty, need scarcely be complained of; any more than that the little which is said of her character and condition is on the fair side; which, though rarely held up, may also be true. Nor will party spirit be found in this volume any more than in the former; the work being written with different objects and feelings.

Having quoted from the London Quarterly Review, I will close these introductory remarks with a passage from the work long its great rival in Britain, the Edinburgh Review; the productions of each, belonging to the literature of the age. It is as follows: "What is told in the fullest and most accurate annals, bears an infinitely small proportion to what is suppressed. The difference between the copious work of Clarendon and the account of the civil wars in Goldsmith's abridgment, vanishes when compared with the immense mass of facts respecting which both are equally silent. No history then, can present us with the whole truth."*

[* Volume for 1828, title History.]

But although no writer, however vast his compass and ability, would ever be able to present the whole truth of such a country as England, under all the manifold combinations of what is great, venerable, and glorious, darkened so often by ills fearfully intermixed with it all, the humblest writer may have the chance of contributing particles to the stock of general knowledge, by keeping to the truth in what little he does present, though his representations be in the main favorable.

R. R.

Sydenham, near Philadelphia,
May, 1845.

MEMORANDA

OF A

RESIDENCE AT THE COURT OF LONDON.

1819—1825.

CHAPTER I.

INTERVIEW WITH LORD CASTLEREAGH ON THE AFFAIRS OF SPANISH AMERICA. DINNER AT THE PORTUGUESE AMBASSADOR'S, TO THE ARCHDUKE MAXIMILIAN OF AUSTRIA—RELATIVE EXPENSE OF THE BRITISH AND AMERICAN ARMY AND NAVY.

February 12, 1819. Had an interview with Lord Castlereagh at his private residence, St. James's Square, on the affairs of Spanish America.

I informed him that I had received a dispatch from my government on that subject, and had sought an interview with him to make known its nature and object. It set out with stating that the United States continued to consider the controversy between Spain

and her colonies in the light of a civil war, and then proceeded to show the duty of a neutral state towards the parties. Next it showed that the conduct of the United States had, in point of fact, conformed to this duty, as far as had been practicable. It spoke of the mediation invoked by Spain for the settlement of the dispute, bringing into view what had also been the uniform course of the United States in relation to that mediation. The dispatch, after dwelling upon the progress which some of the newly formed States in Spanish America had made towards an independent existence, gave into the hope that the time was rapidly approaching, if it had not actually arrived, when the British government and the powers of Europe generally, might perhaps see their own interests, as well as those of Spain, and the fair interests of the new States, in such a recognition of the latter as would bring them within the pale of nations. Finally, it declared, that as regarded Buenos Ayres, the President had come to the determination to grant an exequatur to a consul general who had been appointed by the government of that new state, as long ago as May last, to reside in the United States; or to recognize in some other way its independence, should nothing transpire in the meantime to justify a postponement of his intention.

After this general summary of the essential points, I read to his lordship the dispatch itself.

Some parts of it appeared to take him by surprise. They were those which seemed to import that the government of England was, at bottom, inclining to our view of the subject, as regarded the recognition of the colonies. He said he was not aware upon what occasion he had uttered sentiments leading to this impression, and at any rate, none such had been intended. He remarked, on the contrary, that while Great Britain had, from the first, anxiously desired to see the controversy between Spain and her colonies at an end, and had done her best to effect this result, it had always been upon the basis of a restoration of the supremacy of Spain, on an improved plan of government indeed, especially as regarded the commercial interests of the colonies, but still her entire supremacy; that he thought this mode of ending the conflict, besides being the one pointed out to England by the subsisting relations between herself and Spain, would prove best for both parties, and for other countries, as the materials of regular self-government among the colonies did not appear to exist; which made it impossible to foreknow in what manner they would be able to sustain themselves as independent communities, whether as regarded their own happiness and prosperity, or the princi-

ples which might affect their intercourse with other nations. These, he said, had been the leading motives with England for wishing that the colonies might be brought back again under the authority of the parent state—motives which still had their operation, and must continue, as long as any reasonable expectation was left of the result at which they aimed, being accomplished. The intervention of *force* as a means of its accomplishment, England had ever repudiated, as he formerly told me, and still did; the moral power of opinion and advice being the sole ground upon which she had acted, hitherto, he admitted, to no effective purpose. It was upon this basis, however, that she had agreed to become party to the mediation he had made known to me last summer, and the relations which bound her to the allied powers as well as to Spain, held her to this course, to whatever extent the counsels and conduct of Spain appeared to frustrate or retard the hope of success. He remarked that things stood upon the same general footing now as then, in regard to the mediation; it had been acceded to by the European alliance, but nothing had been effected; the subject had been brought into discussion at Aix la Chapelle during the congress of sovereigns in November, but no act followed; Spain seemed bent upon continuing the war with her own means,

and clung to the hope of bringing it to a close upon her own terms. He said, that during the discussions at Aix la Chapelle, he had found France and Prussia labouring under a belief that the United States desired to be associated in the mediation, and willing to accede to it on the same basis with the European powers, until he had undeceived them, which my communications to him in July had enabled him to do. He particularly mentioned that the Duke of Richelieu had previously been very decided in that belief. His lordship expressed regret that the United States viewed the question of independence in the colonies differently from England, giving as a reason the probable weight of their counsels with the colonies; so that, although my government was no formal party to the mediation, if, nevertheless, it had harmonized in opinion with that of England on the question of independence, the hope would have been increased of seeing the dispute healed the sooner, through the influence which, from local and political causes, the United States might naturally be supposed to have with the colonies. How far it was practicable to settle it, giving back to Spain her supremacy, and granting to the colonies a just government under her sway, was not for him to say; but it was the hope to which the European alliance still clung.

He admitted that Buenos Ayres had given better proofs of capacity to exist as an independent community than any of the other colonies, and he fully admitted also the present and prospective value of our commerce in that quarter, when I mentioned to him that it consisted on our side of such articles as naval stores, ready built vessels, furniture, timber and fish—without enumerating others. The whole tone of his conversation was conciliatory, and he said in conclusion that the frank disclosure I had made to him of the President's views and intentions, would be received by his Majesty's government in the friendly spirit in which it had been made.

This was my first interview with his lordship since the arrival and publication in England of the dispatch which Mr. Adams had addressed to Mr. Erving, our Minister at Madrid, on the 28th of November, relating to the transactions of our army in Florida, under General Jackson, and the execution of Arbuthnot and Ambrister. It had been sent to Congress the latter end of December, with other documents on that whole subject, all of which had been published. The dispatch of Mr. Adams, as an authentic view of the whole, had excited attention in diplomatic circles, and I was not sure that his lordship might not allude to it; but he did not, nor did I. The names of the two men executed, were glanced

at in the course of the interview in an incidental manner. He was remarking, that notwithstanding the neutrality of England as between Spain and her colonies, the latter had undoubtedly received aid from England in arms, ammunition, and men, in ways which the English laws could not prevent. This led him to speak of the order of the court of Madrid of the 14th of January, in which heavy penalties were denounced against all subjects of foreign states who joined the standard of the colonists. He said that this order had been very much felt by France; but he added that England gave herself no concern about it, to whatever commentary the principle on which it assumed to rest, might be open. Those of our subjects, said he, who choose to join the colonists, must take all consequences; they go at their own risk; we can hold out no hand to protect them, any more than we thought ourselves bound to do in the case of the two men who intermeddled with the Indians along your borders. Such was his frank allusion to the case. His lordship hinted at an intention which had, for a while, partially existed, of bringing a bill into Parliament to check the aid which the colonists derived from England, founded on the principle of our acts of Congress; but remarked that it had, hitherto, been abandoned, from difficulties found to attend any attempt to reconcile

with all other parts of their system of law, any new prohibitory statutes upon this subject.

February 14. Dined at Count Palmella's, the Ambassador from Portugal, to whom Mr. Adams had given me a letter. His residence in South Audley street, No. 74, is in a house which has been eighty years in the possession of the Portuguese Embassy at London.

The dinner was given to the Archduke Maximilian, brother to the Emperor of Austria. Besides this Prince and his suite, consisting of several officers in the Austrian service, there were present the Spanish Ambassador, and the Ambassador from the Netherlands; the Danish, Neapolitan, and Saxon Ministers; M. De Neuman, of the Austrian Embassy; Baron Bulow of the Prussian; the Duke of Wellington; Mr. Vansittart, Chancellor of the Exchequer;* Lord Melville, first Lord of the Admiralty, and Lord Lynedoch, formerly General Graham, distinguished in the Peninsular war.

On being introduced to the Archduke Maximilian, he spoke of the United States, entering upon the subject himself, and addressing me in English. Lord Melville took occasion to say to me, that the Spanish Ambassador was making frequent com-

* Afterwards Lord Bexley.

plaints to the British Cabinet of aid, sent from English ports to the Spanish colonies, and calling for a stop to be put to it; which, he added, it was extremely difficult to do. I said that our Secretary of State, probably received as many complaints from the Spanish Minister at Washington; arms, ammunition, and military stores were, without doubt, sometimes exported through evasions of our laws, impossible to be prevented, and Spain was too weak on the ocean to capture them on their way to the colonies, as contraband; which she was at liberty to do, if able. Here was the difficulty, and the law breakers knew it.

At dinner, I sat between the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Lord Lynedoch. Speaking of the property tax, the former mentioned, that the four largest incomes in the kingdom, as returned under it while in operation, were those of the Duke of Northumberland, Earl Grosvenor, the Marquis of Stafford, and the Earl of Bridgewater; these, he said, were the richest peers in England, and there were no commoners whose incomes were returned as large. They each went beyond one hundred thousand pounds, clear of every thing.* Many incomes

* The increasing productiveness of agricultural and mining industry in England, since the above date, has, it is understood, doubled some of these incomes.

among the peers, and several among commoners of large landed estates, approached these in amount; but none came up to them, according to the official returns. Remarking that I found it difficult to arrive at the precise extent of the poor rates, from the published accounts, I asked their amount. He said, that in some counties, as Sussex for instance, they were as high as eight shillings in the pound; and that they probably amounted to about eight millions sterling for all England. We spoke again of the army of England; he said that the whole expense of keeping it up at present, (one hundred thousand men,) was about eight millions sterling—all military pensions included; and added, that it was about as much in pounds sterling, as the expense of keeping up the army of the United States (ten thousand men at that time,) was in dollars. This he explained in part, as formerly, by mentioning the very great preponderance of artillery in our army, on a peace establishment, relative numbers considered. He remarked that our navy was also much more expensive than the British, which he ascribed to our having the best of every thing in it. This was said with his usual courtesy; though I suppose another, and probably a stronger, cause to be, that we have not yet arrived at the true practice of economy—one of the last attainments

of experience and skill in armies and navies, when united with comfort and efficiency. Some of the battles of the Peninsula were touched upon; the Duke of Wellington sat opposite to us, and it was remarked, how fortunate it had been for England that he was not sent to America, after the peace of Paris in 1814. I inferred, that there had been an intention of sending over the Duke to command in the war against the United States; and I afterwards heard, more distinctly, that this measure was in contemplation.

After dinner, I had conversation with the Spanish ambassador, and the Neapolitan minister. With the former, it was limited to ordinary civilities. The latter said handsome things of Mr. Adams's letter to Mr. Erving, and seemed anxious to learn if England had taken any serious exception to the proceedings of our army in Florida, and the execution of the two British subjects. I said that she had not. Then said he, "the newspapers may go on to bark; they bark dreadfully in England, but the ministers don't mind them."

CHAPTER II.

THE OLD BAILEY, GUILDHALL, AND DOCTOR'S COMMONS—OPINION DELIVERED BY SIR WILLIAM SCOTT, JUDGE OF THE HIGH COURT OF ADMIRALTY.

February 22. Went to the Old Bailey. Nothing of much consequence was before the court. A prisoner was on trial for an assault with intent to kill.

Immediately facing the dock where the witnesses stand, I observed the following inscriptions, printed conspicuously in panel work on the wall.

"A false witness shall not be unpunished, and he that speaketh lies shall perish."—*Psalms.*

"Ye shall not swear by my name falsely, neither shalt thou profane the name of thy God."—*Psalms.*

"If a false witness rise up against any man to testify against him that which is wrong, then thou shalt do unto him, as he had thought to have done unto his brother."—*Deuteronomy* xix. 16th and 17th verses.

I went next to Guildhall, where the courts of king's bench and common pleas hold their sittings for the trial of issues; but neither happened to be in session. Over the outside door of the building was the inscription, "DOMINE DIRIGE NOS."

In the great hall, stand monuments to the Earl of Chatham, Mr. Pitt, and Lord Nelson. A remarkable portion of the description on the first, has been noticed in the 16th chapter of the former volume of this work. That on the monument of Mr. Pitt, concludes with these words: viz., "HE DISPENSED FOR TWENTY YEARS THE FAVOURS OF THE CROWN, LIVED WITHOUT OSTENTATION, AND DIED POOR." I next took a bird's eye view of three of the Inns of court, Barnard's Inn, the inner Temple and middle Temple, so associated with sages and ornaments of the law; made short visits to the Custom House, the Royal Exchange, and Stock Exchange, and to Lord Nelson's tomb at St. Paul's, all which the guide books describe better than I could, and hastened home to receive a party engaged to dine at my house on this anniversary of Washington's birth-day. It was composed of members of the diplomatic corps, and several of my countrymen in London; also Mr. John Penn, of Spring Garden, descendant of the founder of Pennsylvania. We had the toast belonging to the day; and what enlightened man of any

nation can fail to do homage to the great name of Washington?

At 12 at night, when our guests had left us, we went to a party at the Marchioness of Salisbury's, Arlington Street; and afterwards to a masquerade at the opera. At the latter, we were in dominoes, as lookers-on at a scene—new to us in Europe.

February 26. Went to Doctors Commons in the hope of seeing Sir William Scott upon the bench, and was not disappointed. I had read the most of his decisions, and had the high opinion of his talents common to all. A salvage case was before the court.

The counsel were Sir Christopher Robinson, Dr. Lushington, Dr. Bernaby and Dr. Dodd, each of whom spoke. In delivering his opinion Sir William Scott dwelt upon the merit of the salvors, and ended with a decree that one-twentieth of the cargo should be awarded to them.

There is a precision and elegance in the recorded opinions of this celebrated judge of the high court of admiralty in England, which induced the Marquis of Lansdowne, when Lord Henry Petty, once to say of them in the House of Commons, that they might be studied as models of classic style, apart from their learning and ability. I had, therefore,

been waiting with curiosity to hear him deliver his opinion. It disappointed me; perhaps because expectation had been raised too high. It was extemporaneous, or delivered without any notes that were perceptible from my position; neither was it long; but his elocution did not appear to me the best; his manner was hesitating: his sentences more than once got entangled, and his words were sometimes recalled that others might be substituted.

But labor, it would seem, must be the condition of all high excellence; from which the genius of this great jurist claimed no exemption. At a subsequent day in England, on one of the many occasions when it was my good fortune to be at the hospitable table of Sir Robert Harry Inglis, Mr. Coleridge was of the company. Sir William Scott being spoken of, and my admiration of his talents expressed, under the salvo that we, in the United States, could not always accede to his doctrines on neutral rights, Mr. Coleridge said, that nothing could exceed the care with which he wrote out and corrected his opinions; that to the decree, as orally pronounced in court, he of course held himself bound; but the language and arrangement, he would vary at pleasure. Not only would he change words while the opinion was passing through the press, but re-construct whole sentences; and an instance was alluded to in which,

after an anxious correction of the proof sheet, and a revise after that, the type was nearly all pulled down to be set up again for some better transposition of the sentences, or improved juxta-position of the testimony, at the last moments before publication. Such was the severe judgment even in matters of style, of this chaste scholar and profound jurist.

> "How finished with illustrious toil appears,
> This small, well-polished, gem, the work of years."

CHAPTER III.

INTERVIEW WITH THE MARQUIS OF LANSDOWNE AND MR. WILBERFORCE ON THE SUBJECT OF THE SLAVE TRADE.—OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE WITH LORD CASTLEREAGH ON THE SUBJECT.

March 4. The Marquis of Lansdowne and Mr. Wilberforce call upon me on the business of the slave trade. The former had written me a note requesting the interview, and I named to-day.

He said, that knowing the real anxiety of the United States to see the downfall of the slave trade, the object of his and Mr. Wilberforce's call upon me, which he remarked was made in their private capacities, was to know whether I thought any mode remained by which the co-operation of my government with the plan proposed to it by Great Britain for suppressing the trade, could still be obtained; adding, that he believed no step would be omitted here, which might promise the least hope of such a result; and further remarking that it was only of my own unofficial opinion, that they desired to receive an intima-

tion, if not objectionable with me to impart it. This opened the door to general conversation on the whole subject, in which they both took part. His Lordship dwelt upon the advantages which might be expected to flow from the co-operation of the United States towards suppressing the traffick, as so prominent a commercial and maritime power of the world; and expressed his strong belief that the example of their union with England could scarcely fail to produce, sooner or later, an important influence upon other nations. His direct inquiry was, whether I thought, that if an act of Parliament were to pass, constituting all participation in the slave trade by British subjects, piracy, upon which an address might afterwards be framed by both houses of Parliament to the Crown, requesting it to renew the proposal recently made to the United States, there would be any reason to suppose they could be brought to yield, under such a modification of the overture, and upon such a basis, the right of search; or whether it would be best for Great Britain to pass such an act of her own accord, and leave to the operation of time its effect upon other nations.

It is hardly necessary for me to speak of Lord Lansdowne as a distinguished and leading member of the Whig party in the House of Peers; or as having shown a desire to carry forward in that body,

the anti-slave trade cause; or, I may add, as a nobleman possessing in an eminent degree the respect and esteem of the party to which he is opposed, while enjoying the entire confidence of his own. It would be as superfluous to speak of the philanthropy of Mr. Wilberforce, or of his long and zealous exertions in the House of Commons and otherwise, to put an end to the slave trade. The aid of such members to any plans of the ministry on this subject, (Mr. Wilberforce not being regularly of the ministerial party) might well be supposed to secure a support nearly, if not entirely, unanimous in both Houses of Parliament; and hence, probably, the inducement with both of these gentlemen, in union with their own sincere zeal in the cause, to this call upon me.

In reply I said, that speaking for the United States without any authority, but giving only my own private impressions, I should say, that the latter course would be best; that is, for England to pass the piracy act suggested, as on her own independent footing, and leave its effects to time. The United States would, in like manner, act upon their independent views in a cause, to the principles of which they had already and long shown their devotion, by substantial acts of legislation; followed up by every step practicable, to render their legislation effective. I adverted to the constitutional grounds which, in

themselves, formed an impediment to their assent to the proposed naval co-operation with Great Britain, and to our general objections to the right of search. With all my present impressions I was forced to say, that I did not think the United States would be willing to subject their flag to the innovation proposed, in time of peace; there were so many recollections, fresh and painful, connected with the searching of their vessels on the high seas by the naval officers of Britain, that the renewal of the practice under whatever circumstances, or for whatever purposes, might naturally be expected to encounter strong dislike all over our country.

This is the substance of what passed on both sides during a conversation which lasted about an hour. I mixed with the expression of my sentiments, all the conciliation towards England proper in itself, which their own manner inspired.

A few days before these gentlemen called, Lord Castlereagh had sent me a parliamentary document comprising a variety of papers relative to the slave trade, which exhibited all that had then lately been done by the powers of Europe on the subject. Amongst them was also the note to me from his Lordship of the 20th of June, 1818, one from me in answer of the 23d of the same month, and a second from me to his Lordship of the 21st of December, 1818. As the first of these notes constitutes the

first approach ever made by England to the United States for concerted naval operations for suppressing the slave trade, perhaps this may be a fit place for inserting it, together with my notes in reply. These will show the subject historically between the two governments. It was followed up between them, in my hands, on the part of our government, until near the close of my mission, as future parts of this work will show, when my connexion with it ceased. The subject, at last, ended in the 8th article of the treaty of Washington in 1842, negotiated by Mr. Webster and Lord Ashburton, which provides that each nation shall keep in service on the coast of Africa a squadron of not less than eighty guns, to act for the suppression of the trade, in manner as the article points out—the article being liable to annulment at the desire of either party, after the expiration of five years.

His lordship's first note to me, was as follows:

Foreign Office, June 20, 1818.

Sir,

The distinguished share which the government of the United States has, from the earliest period, borne in advancing the cause of abolition,* makes the British government desirous of submitting to their

* This word, as here used, meant abolition of the *slave trade*.

favourable consideration whatever may appear to them calculated to bring about the final accomplishment of this great work of humanity.

The laudable anxiety with which you personally interest yourself in whatever is passing upon this important subject, will have led you to perceive that, with the exception of the Crown of Portugal, all European States have now either actually prohibited the traffick in slaves to their subjects, or fixed an early period for its cessation, whilst Portugal has also renounced it to the north of the Equator. From May, 1820, there will not be a flag which *can legally* cover this detested traffick to the north of the line, and there is reason to hope, that the Portuguese may also ere long be prepared to abandon it to the south of the Equator; but so long as some effectual concert is not established amongst the principal maritime powers for preventing their respective flags from being made a cover for an illicit slave-trade, there is but too much reason to fear, (whatever be the state of the law upon this subject) that the evil will continue to exist, and, in proportion as it assumes a contraband form, that it will be carried on under the most aggravating circumstances of cruelty and desolation.

It is from a deep conviction of this truth, founded upon experience, that the British government, in all

its negotiations upon this subject, has endeavoured to combine a system of alliance for the suppression of this most abusive practice, with the engagements which it has succeeded in lately contracting with the governments of Spain and Portugal for a total, or partial, abolition of the slave-trade. I have now the honor to enclose to you copies of the treaties which have been happily concluded with those powers, together with the acts which have recently passed the legislature for carrying the same into execution.

I have also the satisfaction to transmit to you a copy of a treaty which has been recently concluded with the King of the Netherlands for the like purpose, though at too late a period in the session to admit of its provisions receiving the sanction of Parliament. I am induced the more particularly to call your attention to this convention, as it contains certain provisions which are calculated to limit, in some respects, the powers mutually conceded, by the former treaties, in a manner which, without essentially weakening their force, may render them more acceptable to the contracting parties.

The intimate knowledge which you possess of this whole subject renders it unnecessary for me, in requesting you to bring these documents to the observation of your government, to accompany them

with any more detailed explanation: what I have *earnestly* to beg of you is, to bring them under the serious consideration of the President, intimating to him the strong wish of the British government, that the exertions of the two states may be combined upon a somewhat similar principle, in order to put down this great moral disobedience, wherever it may be committed, to the laws of both countries. I am confident this cannot effectually be done, except by mutually conceding to each other's ships of war a qualified right of search, with a power of detaining the vessels of either state with *slaves actually on board.*

You will perceive in these conventions a studious, and I trust a successful attempt, to narrow and limit this power within due bounds, and to guard it against perversion. If the American government is disposed to enter into a similar concert, and can suggest any further regulations the better to obviate abuse, this government will be most ready to listen to any suggestion of this nature; their only object being to contribute, by every effort in their power, to put an end to this disgraceful traffick.

I have the honor to be with great truth,

Sir,

Your most obedient, humble servant,

CASTLEREAGH.

RICHARD RUSH, Esquire,

&c. &c. &c.

The italics are as used in the original note. The following was my first answer:

London, June 23d, 1818.

51, Baker Street.

My Lord,

I have been honored with your note of the twentieth of this month, enclosing copies of treaties recently concluded between this government and the governments of Portugal, Spain and the Netherlands respectively, in relation to the slave-trade, and designed to draw the attention of the government of the United States to this subject with a view to its co-operation, upon principles similar to those held out in these treaties, in measures that may tend to the more complete and universal abolition of the trade.

The United States, from an early day of their history, have regarded with uniform abhorrence the existence of a traffick attended by such complications of misery and guilt. Its transcendent evils, roused throughout all ranks a corresponding zeal for their extirpation: one step followed another, until humanity triumphed, and against the continuance

of the trade in any shape by their own citizens, the most absolute prohibitions of their laws, have, for a period of more than ten years, been vigorously, and it is hoped effectually, levelled. This allusion to the earnest efforts of the United States to put down the traffick within their own limits, merely falls in with the tribute your lordship has so justly paid to their early exertions in helping to dry up this prolific source of human wo.

Whether any causes may throw obstacles in the way of their uniting in that concert of external measures in which Europe generally, and this nation in particular, are now so happily engaged, the more effectually to banish from the world this great enormity, I dare not, in the absence of all instructions, presume to intimate; much less have I any opinion of my own to offer upon a subject so full of delicacy and interest. But it is left for me to say, that I shall perform a grateful duty in transmitting, by the earliest opportunity, copies of your lordship's note, and the documents which accompanied it, to my government; and I sufficiently know the permanent sensibility which pervades all its counsels upon this subject to promise, that the overture which the former embraces, will receive from the President the full consideration due to its importance, and to the enlarged philanthropy on the

part of this government by which it has been dictated.

I have the honor to be
with the highest consideration,
Your lordship's
obedient faithful servant,
RICHARD RUSH.

The Right Honorable
Lord Viscount CASTLEREAGH,
His Majesty's principal
Secretary of State for
Foreign Affairs.

Lord Castlereagh's note and the documents, were promptly forwarded to my government, and on receiving its instructions, I addressed to him the note following : viz.

The undersigned, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary from the United States, has the honor to present his compliments to Lord Castlereagh.

In the note of the 23d of June, which the undersigned had the honor to address to Lord Castlereagh in answer to his lordship's communication of the 20th of the same month, relative to the slave-trade, the undersigned had great pleasure in giving the assu-

rance that he would transmit a copy of that communication to his government, with the documents which accompanied it, being copies of treaties entered into on the part of Great Britain, with Spain, Portugal and the Netherlands, for the more complete abolition of the odious traffick in slaves. He accordingly lost no time in fulfilling that duty, and has now the honor to inform Lord Castlereagh of the instructions with which he has been furnished by his government in reply.

He has been distinctly instructed, in the first place, to make known the sensibility of the President to the friendly spirit of confidence in which these treaties, and the legislative measures founded upon them, have been communicated to the United States; and to the invitation which has been given that they would join in the same or similar engagements, the more effectually to accomplish the beneficent object to which they look. He is further commanded to give the strongest assurances, that the solicitude of the United States for the universal extirpation of this traffick, continues with all the earnestness which has so long and steadily distinguished the course of their policy in relation to it. Of their general prohibitory law of 1807, it is unnecessary that the undersigned should speak, Lord Castlereagh being already apprized of its provisions; amongst which the authority to employ the national force as auxiliary to

its execution will not have escaped attention. But he has it in charge to make known, as a new pledge of their unremitting and active desire for the abolition of the slave-trade, that, so lately as the month of April last, another Act of Congress was passed, by which not only are the citizens and vessels of the United States interdicted from carrying on, or being in any way engaged in, the trade, but in which also the best precautions that legislative enactments can devise or their penalties enforce, are raised up against the introduction into their territories of slaves from abroad, under whatever pretext attempted, and especially from dominions which lie more immediately in their neighborhood. A copy of this act is herewith enclosed for the more particular information of Lord Castlereagh. That peculiarity in the eighth section which throws upon a defendant the labor of proof as the condition of acquittal, the undersigned persuades himself will be regarded as signally manifesting an anxiety to suppress the hateful traffick, departing as it does from the principle of criminal jurisprudence which so generally requires the independent and positive establishment of guilt, as the first step in criminal prosecutions. To measures of such a character, thus early adopted and steadily pursued, the undersigned is further commanded to say, that the government of the United States, acting within the pale of its constitu-

tional powers, will always be ready to superadd any others that experience may prove to be necessary for attaining the desirable end in view.

But on examining the provisions of the treaties which Lord Castlereagh honored the undersigned by communicating to him, it has appeared to the President that their essential articles are of a character not adapted to the circumstances or to the institutions of the United States.

The powers agreed to be given to the ships of war of either party to search, capture and carry into port for adjudication, the merchant vessels of the other, however qualified, is connected with the establishment, by each treaty, of two mixed courts, one of which is to have its seat in the colonial possessions of the parties respectively. The institution of such tribunals is necessarily regarded as fundamental to the whole arrangement, whilst their peculiar structure is doubtless intended, and would seem, to be indispensable, towards imparting to it a just reciprocity. But to this part of the system, the United States, having no colonies upon the coast of Africa, in the West Indies, or elsewhere, cannot give effect.

Moreover, the powers of government in the United States, whilst they can only be exercised within the grants, are also subject to the restrictions, of the Federal Constitution. By the latter Instrument, all

judicial power is to be vested in a Supreme Court, and in such other inferior courts, as Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. It further provides, that the Judges of these courts shall hold their offices during good behaviour, and be removeable on impeachment and conviction of crimes and misdemeanors. There are serious doubts whether, obeying the spirit of these injunctions, the government of the United States would be competent to appear as party to the institution of a court for carrying into execution their penal statutes in places out of their own territory; a court consisting partly of foreign Judges, not liable to impeachment under the authority of the United States, and deciding upon their statutes without appeal.

Again. Obstacles would exist towards giving validity to the disposal of the negroes found on board the slave-trading vessels condemned by the sentence of the mixed courts. If they should be delivered over to the government of the United States as freemen, they could not, but by their own consent, be employed as servants or free laborers. The condition of negroes and other people of color in the United States, being regulated by the municipal laws of the separate states, the government of the former could neither guarantee their liberty in the states where they could only be received as slaves,

nor control them in the states where they would be recognised as free. The provisions of the fifth section of the act of Congress which the undersigned has the honor to enclose, will be seen to point to this obstacle, and may be taken as still further explanatory of its nature.

These are some of the principal reasons which arrest the assent of the President to the very frank and friendly overture contained in Lord Castlereagh's communication. Having their foundation in constitutional impediments, the government of His Britannic Majesty will know how to appreciate their force. It will be seen how compatible they are with the most earnest wishes on the part of the United States that the measures concerted by these treaties may bring about the total downfall of the traffick in human blood, and with their determination to co-operate, to the utmost extent of their constitutional power, towards this great consummation, so imperiously due at the hands of all nations to the past wrongs and sufferings of Africa.

The undersigned prays Lord Castlereagh to accept the assurances of his distinguished consideration.

RICHARD RUSH.

London,
December 21st, 1818.

It was to the non-assent conveyed in this last note, that Lord Lansdowne had reference when he made

his inquiries as to the hope of removing it on the ground stated. It will be seen hereafter to what extent, and upon what conditions, the United States yielded up their refusal. One of the parliamentary documents sent to me by Lord Castlereagh, attests how unequivocal had been the refusal of France at that epoch, to allow her vessels to be boarded and searched at sea for slaves. Nevertheless, it would appear, from a passage in a note from Lord Castlereagh to Lord Bathurst, dated the 10th of December, at Paris—the last paper in the series—that the former still indulged a sanguine expectation that the French government might be brought, at no distant day, to re-consider its refusal.

CHAPTER IV.

WEEKS'S MUSEUM — ITS EXTRAORDINARY COLLECTION.—ROYAL CHAPEL, WHITEHALL.—LEVEE AT CARLTON HOUSE—AUSTRIAN COURT AT THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA.—INTERVIEW WITH LORD CASTLEREAGH ON SPANISH AMERICAN AFFAIRS AND OTHER SUBJECTS.—THE CASES OF ARBUTHNOT AND AMBRISTER TO BE BROUGHT BEFORE PARLIAMENT.—DINNER AT THE MARQUIS OF LANSDOWNE'S—SIR JAMES MACINTOSH.—VOTE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REFUSING TO CENSURE GENERAL JACKSON.—NEWS OF THE CESSION OF THE FLORIDAS TO THE UNITED STATES, ARRIVES IN LONDON.—NOTE TO LORD CASTLEREAGH ON EXTRA DUTIES CHARGED ON VESSELS OF THE UNITED STATES.

March 5. Visit Weeks's museum, in Tichborne street, which consists chiefly of specimens of mechanism. There were birds that not only sung, but hopt from stick to stick in their cages; there were mice made of pearl, that could run about nimbly; there were human figures of full size playing on musical instruments, in full band—though neither musicians, nor mice, nor birds, had a particle

of life in them. There were silver swans swimming in water, serpents winding themselves up trees, tarantulas running backwards and forwards—all equally without life; in short, a collection too numerous and curious for me to attempt to describe. There were clocks of curious workmanship, and in great variety. Besides being musical, some of them, in the shape of temples, were ornamented in the richest manner. The proprietor said that his collection in clocks alone, was of the value of thirty thousand pounds Sterling. His entire collection he valued at four hundred thousand pounds. It was prepared for the Chinese market, where such articles would be in demand at the prices he put upon them; so he confidently said, though valuing some of his birds at a thousand guineas a-piece. He said that the government of China would not permit the English to have intercourse with them for such purposes, and seemed to be in present despair; but he added, that "one of these days England would oblige China to receive her wares, by making her feel the strong arm of her power." The outside of this museum, looks like a common shop for umbrellas and other small wares; as, in fact, it is, in front. No one in passing along would ever dream of what it contains as you advance inside, and get towards the rear.

It may be taken, perhaps, as one of the evidences

of the immensity of London, that although I occasionally spoke of this collection in society afterwards, I hardly met with any one who had as much as heard of it. It was not, to be sure, a place in which to pass whole days as in the British museum, where I have been; that repository of the memorials of genius, science, literature, history and the arts; but it was a remarkable sample of that exquisite subdivision in mechanical genius, in a field bearing neither upon the useful arts nor fine arts, to be found only in a vast metropolis. The interior mechanism of the little spider, was said to be composed of more than one hundred distinct pieces. My attention had been drawn to the collection by a friend from Canada, with whom I went to see it. What the proprietor said about the trade between England and China, I copy precisely as I wrote down his words, nearly five and twenty years ago; and it would seem as if he had spoken in a prophetic spirit. He himself is in all probability no longer among the living, for he told us he was seventy-six years old; but if he left descendants, he may have indulged in the same prediction to them as to me; and if the collection came to their hands, a market for it in China may give them at last the benefit of their ancestor's ingenuity in so curious a line of British art. The Emperor Charles V. in his retirement, had, among his other pastimes, pup-

pets that moved like men; but is not added, I believe, that they could play on musical instruments, like Mr. Weeks's.

March 14. Went to church at the Royal Chapel, Whitehall. This was once the great banqueting room of the ancient Palace of Whitehall. Directly in front of it, before the large window, on a scaffold erected for the purpose, Charles I. was beheaded. The whole service seemed the more impressive, within a building calculated to call up in the mind of a stranger, for the first time there, associations of royal banquets and royal agony. A regiment of the foot guards attended, and sat in the gallery.

March 18. Went to the levee at Carlton House. It was very full. Being the first held since the Queen's death, every body wore mourning. The Archduke Maximilian was there. Speaking of him with M. De Neuman, the latter represented him as among the best informed princes in Europe. I again had some conversation with him about the United States, on his introduction of the subject. Next I conversed with Lord Castlereagh, who said, among other things, speaking of the Austrian Court, that at the congress of Vienna in 1815, the Emperor entertained all the sovereigns, princes, and mi-

nisters then assembled in that capital; keeping them all at his own expense, as long as they staid, and providing houses or palaces for their residence. Some idea, he said, might be formed of the scale on which it was done, when he mentioned that the principal equerry of the Emperor had orders to have several hundred horses in readiness, daily, for the accommodation and pleasure of these his distinguished guests, and all who moved in their train. Not only were tables provided for all, but each of the guests, including secretaries, aids, and attachés, were desired to bring to the tables any of their friends whom the great events of Europe might have drawn to that capital. I ventured to intimate that such imperial hospitality, having no House of Commons or House of Representatives to call for its items, was doubtless agreeable to those who dispensed, and to those who received it; at which point of our conversation, his lordship's attention being drawn off by Lord Westmoreland, of the cabinet, we separated. He approached me again in an hour to request that I would call upon him at his private residence on the 21st, having something to say to me on Spanish affairs.

March 21. Call on Lord Castlereagh, according to appointment. His house had just been undergoing repairs, particularly in window glass, from the

effects of some acts of violence committed upon it by the mob at the recent special election for Westminster.

He informed me, that since our last conversation on Spanish affairs, the subject of the mediation had taken a decisive turn. Spain had finally declined all mediating offices; there seemed therefore to be an end of the whole matter, as regarded any further steps to be taken by England, or by the powers of Europe. He recapitulated the history of this proffered mediation, now come to nothing; he went over grounds connected with its origin and progress; adverted to what had passed at Aix-la-Chapelle, and said that if the mediation had been acted upon, the plan of the Allies was, that Spain should concede to such of her colonies as had not been in general revolt, the same terms, as far as applicable to their future government, as were proposed to be granted to those which had openly resisted her authority. He also said that it had been suggested that some individual in whom Spain herself as well as the Allies had confidence, should be selected to go to Madrid with full powers from the latter in the whole business of the mediation. The Duke of Wellington had been designated as the person; but Spain had not acceded to the proposition. He observed further, that Spain had made a request to send a representative to the congress at Aix-la-Cha-

pelle; but this was not deemed of a nature to be acquiesced in. These were the main points mentioned by his lordship, not stated to me on former occasions. He remarked that the inference from all was, that Spain had now resolved to rely upon her own efforts by sea and land, and on the supplies of her own treasury, for putting down rebellion throughout all the dominions of Ferdinand. This resolution had come about, he added, through the change of the ministry in that country; an event which took place at about the time of the assemblage of the sovereigns at Aix-la-Chapelle. His lordship concluded by remarking, that this rejection of the mediation would not influence the course which Great Britain would otherwise have adopted under the communication I made to him last month, about our intended recognition of Buenos Ayres; meaning, as he explained, that it had created no unfriendly sensibility in the British cabinet towards Spain, however inexpedient her course might be thought.

This subject being disposed of for the present, I took the opportunity of bringing to his lordship's notice some additional proof of the guilt of Arbuthnot and Ambrister, applicable, in this instance, chiefly to the former. It was contained in a printed document received in a late despatch from the Secretary of State, presenting the "Talk" sent by

Oponey, a chief of the Upper Creek Indians in March, 1817, to the Big Warrior, principal chief of that nation. I described the nature of this talk, and its unequivocal bearing upon Arbuthnot's guilt. His lordship not being certain whether Mr. Bagot had transmitted the pamphlet which contained it, I put a copy into his hands, with references to the proper passages. He listened to all I said, and not without interest; remarking, that the subject would come before Parliament—Lord Lansdowne having intimated to Lord Liverpool his intention of moving it in the House of Peers. He further remarked, that the course which the investigation had taken in the House of Representatives at Washington was calculated to embarrass the cabinet of England, the speeches of our own members having sharply denounced General Jackson. These, he said, were cited and dwelt upon in the English Journals, and cast by the opposition into the teeth of the ministry, who had viewed the subject in lights different from those members of Congress.

I next made his lordship acquainted with the circumstance of the outrage committed upon the consul of the United States at Tripoli in September, by some negro slaves of an officer of the Bashaw, and of the part acted by the British Consul on the occa-

sion; to whom a declaration was imputed, that all that had been done, was under the orders of his government. I found that the matter was new to Lord Castlereagh; but he said at once that there never could have been any orders or instructions of any description whatever, going to sanction unfriendly treatment towards our public officers, or any of our citizens in that quarter. He added, that the concerns of the British government with the Barbary powers, were under the more immediate cognizance of the colonial department, and referred me to Lord Bathurst for further conversation respecting this case, or whatever representations it might call for.

Before our interview closed, I spoke of the right of search. I said it was in vain to disguise the sensitive feeling which the people of the United States had, whenever its exercise on the high seas was proposed, no matter what the object: and consequently my fears for the result of his proposal to us about the slave-trade. He replied, that he was aware of our objections; but added, that as he did not despair of France and Russia conceding it in the end, notwithstanding all that had passed at Aix-la-Chapelle, he would not surrender the hope that we too would give up our scruples at a future day for the sake of carrying forward so great a cause.

March 22. Dined at the Marquis of Lansdowne's. The Duke of Bedford, Prince Poniatoski, Sir James Macintosh, Count Ludolf, Mr. Adair, former ambassador from England at Constantinople, and Mr. Alexander Baring,* were of the company. I sat next to Sir James Macintosh. He spoke in the highest terms of our host, remarking that his talents were of the first order, his temper and discretion equal to his talents.

All my impressions go to confirm these opinions; yet I fear that he means to take part against us in the case of Arbuthnot and Ambrister, not only from what Lord Castlereagh said yesterday, but other indications. Before going to dinner, his servant brought in one of the evening papers. His lordship opening it for a moment, noticed the news which had arrived in the morning, of the House of Representatives having refused to pass a vote of censure on General Jackson. He simply read over the vote, the Duke of Bedford, Mr. Baring, and Sir James Macintosh, listening. The majority against censuring him, being 46, his lordship supposed it to be small, and looked to me for information. I remarked that it would rather be considered large for our House of Representatives; a body much less nu-

* Since Lord Ashburton.

merous than the House of Commons. No comments were made, or any political subject alluded to afterwards in that classic dining room, where it was not for the first time I had been a guest.

After dinner, I had renewed conversations with Sir James Macintosh.

Alluding to the style of speaking in the House of Commons, he characterized it by saying that "the true light in which to consider it, was *as animated conversation on public business;*" and he added, that it was "rare for any speech to succeed in that body which was raised on any other basis." He thought Mr. Brougham the first man in the House for various and universal information on political subjects; Mr. Canning and Mr. Plunkett, on the whole, the first orators. Mr. Canning, he said, excelled all the rest in language.

So spoke, in few and significant words, on an ample subject, this deep and calm observer of men and things, this profound master in speculative thought; to me ever instructive when I meet him; the modern Burke, for so I must consider him; wanting, to be sure, his diligence and energy in carrying onward great public affairs, but scarcely inferior in mental powers under the highest state of discipline; in conversation, uniting condensation, to knowledge the most abundant and various; and so benignant in

temper, that you never hear him harsh upon any one, his powers of analysis seeming to delight (so it has ever been when I have heard him talk) in justly discriminating the talents and virtues of his great contemporaries. Nor does he keep back the merit of political opponents, whilst true to his own faith. How rare such a man, and what a model for politicians!

March 23. The vote of the House of Representatives, refusing to pass censure on General Jackson, has produced a slight depression in the English funds. The newspapers break out into violent language. Some of them, in attempting to account for the injustice and ferocity with which, as they say, it brands our character, insist that it must arise from the existence of negro slavery among us. The Morning Chronicle, a Journal of deservedly high character with the Whigs, seems of this opinion. Strange opinion, when the Southern planters in the states where slavery exists as planted by the laws of England, yield to no part of our population in solid virtues, and in all the elements which go to make up that high character—the gentleman. That Washington was the growth of our Southern soil, ought, of itself, to save it from such inconsiderate denunciations.

March 25. News arrives of the cession of the Floridas by Spain to the United States. The English papers raise a clamor, charging ambition and rapacity upon the United States. They say nothing of the acquisitions which England has been making in all parts of the globe, by her arms or policy, since the days of Elizabeth and Cromwell! Even if we were to show some tincture of ambition, still, as her own children, disposed to act in her own spirit, her journalists might make allowances; but, in fact, we acquire Florida by fair treaty; we give Spain the quid pro quo to the uttermost farthing; and the last thing that I anticipate, is complaint from a mind like Lord Castlereagh's.

So expressing myself of Lord Castlereagh, I will go farther. In the former volume of this work, I have borne testimony to what I believe to have been the liberal views of this Foreign Secretary of England in regard to the relations between our two countries; and I now desire to do it again, on authentic grounds. The convention of last October, produced complaint among portions of the people both of England and the United States; as is apt to be the case, after all treaties between ambitious and powerful nations, approaching in any points, to rivalry. There were parts of the convention not relished on our side; and those who were interested in the British North American Fisheries, clamored

exceedingly at the article about the fisheries, alleging that England had surrendered every thing to the United States. They even asked pecuniary indemnification from the English government, for what it had given up. Lord Castlereagh, in alluding to these clamors, said to me, that his government was unmoved by them; and that he thought it of less moment which of the parties gained a little more or lost a little more by the compact, than that so difficult a point should be adjusted, and the harmony of the two countries, so far, be made secure; adding his belief, on full examination, that each party had gained every substantial advantage needed. This was true wisdom. I did not fail to communicate his sentiments to my government. Out-door clamor is little aware of the difficulties which governments often experience in arranging clashing interests between great nations; and too little inclined to ask, whether it is not better sometimes, for each to abate a little, than determine to face all the consequences of standing out too stiffly on ground taken at first.

April 27. Having received information through our consul at Liverpool and the American Chamber of Commerce of that town, that the collectors of light money and pilotage continue to demand on all ves-

sels from the United States frequenting that port, the rates of light money and pilotage payable on foreign vessels, I this day wrote to Lord Castlereagh, the subjoined note:

The Undersigned, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary from the United States, has the honour to present his compliments to Lord Castlereagh.

On the 28th of September last, the undersigned had the honor to address a note to Lord Bathurst respecting certain extra duties and charges which, notwithstanding the provisions of the convention of the third of July, 1815, were levied upon vessels of the United States entering the ports of Great Britain, to the contents of which he prays at this time to call the attention of Lord Castlereagh.

It is with renewed concern that the undersigned is obliged to state, that, since the period of his above note, information has reached him, that the collectors of light money and pilotage at Liverpool, have continued to demand on all American ships, and that the masters or consignees of the latter have ever since been forced to pay, the rates of light money and pilotage payable on foreign vessels, instead of those payable on British vessels, as stipulated by the convention. These extra duties, it is true, are

refunded to the American claimants, on application being made to that effect; but it is distinctly represented to the undersigned, that the return cannot be had until the application has been made by the claimants first at Liverpool and afterwards in London, at an expense, including the whole proceeding, of not less than ten per cent. upon the amount due to them.

It is plain that so long as they are put to any expense whatever in recovering back sums which, under the convention, were not originally due, its provisions are not substantially executed; and it seems alike obvious that more or less expense must always be incurred, as long as the necessity and burden of the application for refunding is made to fall upon the claimants.

The undersigned has been specially instructed by his government to draw the attention of Lord Castlereagh to this subject; and he is persuaded that nothing beyond this is necessary to induce his lordship to cause the necessary orders to be issued to the proper officers of all the ports of the kingdom, but more especially at Liverpool, to exact in future no other or higher duties or charges on American vessels for any purpose whatever, than those fixed by the convention between the two countries; a measure becoming the more important from the du-

ration of that instrument having been happily extended to a further term of ten years.

The undersigned takes advantage of this opportunity to tender to Lord Castlereagh, the assurances of his distinguished consideration.

RICHARD RUSH.

To the Right Honorable
Lord Viscount Castlereagh,
His Majesty's principal Secretary
of State for Foreign Affairs.

CHAPTER V.

DINNER AT PRINCE ESTERHAZY'S.—REMARKABLE INCIDENT AT IT.--DINNER AT LORD TEIGNMOUTH'S.—INTERVIEW WITH THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE, RELATIVE TO THE EXTRA DUTIES.—LETTER TO THE CONSUL OF THE UNITED STATES AT LIVERPOOL IN CONNEXION WITH THIS SUBJECT.—DINNER AT THE SPANISH AMBASSADOR'S.—MOTION IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS ON THE CASES OF ARBUTHNOT AND AMBRISTER. —ENGLISH FOREIGN ENLISTMENT BILL.—PARTY AT THE COUNTESS OF JERSEY'S; AT COUNTESS GROSVERNOR'S.

May 3. Dined with Prince Esterhazy, the Austrian Ambassador. The dinner was given to the new French Ambassador, the Marquis Latour Maubourg, lately arrived at the English court as successor to the Marquis d'Osmond; recalled, it was undestood, at his own request, not wishing to remain after the Duke of Richelieu ceased to be Minister of Foreign affairs in France. The company was large, consisting of ambassadors, ministers plenipotentiary

and chargés; the Marquis of Anglesey, the Prince of Hesse Philippsthal, and other distinguished guests.

Dinner was announced at 8 o'clock, and when the company were seated, an incident probably struck all. On the right of Prince Esterhazy, sat the new French Ambassador, as chief guest; and on his left, were the Prince of Hesse Philippsthal and the Marquis of Anglesey. Amongst these three, there were but three *legs*. The French Ambassador had lost one of his in the French service, at the battle of Leipsic; the Prince of Hesse Philippsthal, one of his, at the battle of Borodino, in the Russian service; and the Marquis of Anglesey one of his, at the battle of Waterloo, fighting in the ranks of England. When I attended the Prince Regent's first levee, my attention was drawn to the number of maimed and wounded English officers present; and, here, this evening, were accidentally assembled, side by side, three officers of different nations, each of high rank, and each having lost a limb.

Getting back to the drawing-rooms to coffee, I made the acquaintance of the French Ambassador. His fame, as a general of cavalry in the armies of France, is a part of history. I have once spoken of him in a preceding part of this work. His friends dwell with pride on the charge he made upon a body

of horse, at the battle of Leipsic; upon which occasion the Emperor of Russia was in danger of captivity. His troops called him the Bayard of France; and he appears as attractive by his manners, as he was formidable in war.

In conversation with the Marquis of Anglesey, he asked whether the United States had not lost much of the carrying trade since the general peace; and while on this topick also asked, whether large portions of the seamen in our public ships during the war, had not been British. I said, in reference to the latter, that the impression seemed very general in England, to be such as his question implied, but was not borne out by facts: many British seamen, were, undoubtedly, found in our merchant vessels in time of peace, as ours were found in the merchant vessels of other nations, though not in such numbers; but from our *public* vessels, we carefully excluded foreign seamen, and had done so in an especial manner, by positive orders, during the late war; doubtless some had got on board, notwithstanding, but the number was extremely small. As to the carrying trade, I said, that we had lost much of it, but our tonnage held its own through the increase of the coasting trade, and increasing export of our home productions; which, being generally bulky, called for a large amount of tonnage.

May 6. Dined at Lord Teignmouth's. The Bishop of Doyne, Lord Gambier, Mr. Grant, Mr. John Owen, and a few others in addition to the family of Lord Teignmouth, were of the company.

I asked Mr. Grant, who was a director of the East India Company, if it were publicly known what objects, commercial or other, had brought to London the Persian Ambassador—Mirza Abul Hassan Khan. He said that he was not informed of them; that from Great Britain to Persia, not a ship sailed at present, as far as he knew, and there was not much, if any, communication between the two countries over-land. The only intercourse which existed, was through a few vessels going from British India to the coasts of the gulf of Ormus, and Persian Gulf, where they carried articles of British manufacture. For these, payment was made in the gold coins of Venice, which had continued to circulate in that part of Persia since the days when Venetian commerce took the lead in the East. Lord Teignmouth said that the sequin was still struck at Venice, and found its way through Turkey into Persia. His lordship could well join in this part of the conversation, having been a traveller into Persia, and understanding its language.

After dinner we found a party assembling in the drawing-rooms, amongst whom was Lord Hill,

whose acquaintance I made, and whose military reputation in England, seems scarcely second to any but the Duke of Wellington's.

I count it a good fortune to have enjoyed the acquaintance of Lord Teignmouth and to have lived in his neighbourhood in London. Not speaking of him here as Governor General of India whilst Sir John Shore, and performing great duties in the Empire which Clive founded and the Wellesleys extended, or as a scholar, an author, and a gentleman, I will barely say, that, besides the hospitalities acceptable to a stranger which I received from him, I would gratefully allude to other and more touching kindnesses from himself and Lady Teignmouth, when death and grief entered our domicil. It was then that they did what only the kindest of friends do.

May 7. Call on Mr. Robinson, President of the board of Trade, under a special appointment. He is now also of the Cabinet. I represent to him the inconvenience to which our citizens are put by the demands still made at Liverpool for extra duties and charges upon their vessels, and request that the practice may cease as matter of right to the American merchant and ship owner. He informs me that he was devising a plan which he hoped to mature

very soon, the object of which was, not to require payment in the first instance of any alien duties or port charges by our vessels; as the obtaining of them back must always be attended with trouble, even if expense could be avoided. I said that this was the only course to be taken, and the one which our citizens claimed under the Convention of 1815. He agreed to this construction of it, and gave me to understand that it would be brought about.

May 8. It does not come within my intention to notice the correspondence I carried on during my mission, with the consuls of the United States residing at the ports of Great Britain, the extent and importance of whose duties are not perhaps sufficiently considered by our government. My correspondence with them was far too frequent to attempt even summary allusions to it, though sometimes it embraced subjects of high and delicate international concern; but a letter to the consul at Liverpool, written to-day, is inserted, relating, as it mainly does, to the construction of the convention between the two countries, and following up as it also does the subject of the preceding memorandum, and of my note to Lord Castlereagh of the 27th of April. I give it therefore entire:

Legation of the United States.
London, May 8, 1819.

Dear Sir,

Unavoidable causes have prevented my answering at an earlier day several of your late communications. I now proceed to do so.

Respecting the demand still made upon our vessels at Liverpool of alien duties for pilotage and light money, of which American citizens, or those representing them in this country, with so much reason complain, I have addressed a note to Lord Castlereagh requesting that the practice may cease.

It is not the first time I have had occasion to address this government officially to the same purport. I have also called upon Mr. Robinson, President of the Board of Trade, and a member of the Cabinet, and had a conversation with him on the subject. My application to him distinctly was, that our citizens be freed altogether from any demand whatever for these extra duties. It is to this complete exemption that they are entitled under the Convention. If they are made to pay in the first instance, it cannot be expected that the amount can be refunded to them without trouble, even if expense could be avoided; and it is as little just to expose them to the one as the other. Mr. Robinson promised an early attention to my application; and I hope that the result may prove satisfactory to the just expectations

of our citizens, as I shall feel at a loss, in a contrary issue, what further measures to take on their behalf, without new instructions from home. But I cannot doubt the friendly disposition of this government, and of course its desire to do all that is just and proper on the occasion. This will be an answer to your letter of the 17th of April, which enclosed a copy of the memorial from the American chamber of commerce at Liverpool to the Lords of the Treasury.

I do not feel so clear as to the ground on which our ship-owners stand, respecting the export duty upon coals, as set forth in the paper accompanying your letter of the 28th of April. The Convention protects us against any higher duties than could be laid on an exportation of the article to any other foreign country; and places vessels of the United States in all respects upon the same footing with British vessels. But it seems that twenty-two shillings sterling a chaldron, is not higher than the sum charged on an exportation to other countries; and that this sum is to be charged when the article is taken to the United States in a British, in the same manner as when taken in an American ship. I therefore have my doubts at present in what particular the Convention is violated, and will come to no final opinion, but wait further explanations.

As regards the point stated in your letter of the

13th of April, I do not feel free to express an opinion upon it. It grows out of an Act of Congress long in operation, but differently viewed, it seems, by our different consuls in these dominions, and the construction of which has now been submitted to the Secretary of State for his decision. In this state of the question, I cannot interpose.

On the case presented by your letter of the 5th of this month I am of opinion, that where the facts establish a mutiny, the men are not entitled to three months' extra wages on being discharged by the captain in a foreign port. The act of Congress never could have intended that American seamen should be allowed to make profit of their crimes. This would be the case, if, when the master is obliged to discharge them for criminal conduct they could demand this bounty. The entire spirit of the act imports that their title to it was to rest on other grounds, and it is of the essence of every law not to be construed in a manner to work consequences pernicious or absurd. The documents which you transmitted to me on this subject are returned.

I examined your accounts for the quarter ending on the 31st of March, and have given Mr. Williams a draft in your favor upon the Messieurs Barings for £609. 14. 5., the sum appearing to be due to you.

Your letter of the first of this month and the despatches to me which it announced from the Department of State, came safely to hand.

With great respect
and esteem, I am
Dear Sir, your obt. Serv't.
RICHARD RUSH.

JAMES MAURY, Esquire,
Consul of the United States,
Liverpool.

In regard to accounts of the consul above referred to, it may be stated, that it devolved upon me to examine those of all the consuls of the United States in Great Britain and Ireland every quarter, and pay them the money due, which Congress provided; the whole of which fund, as far as concerned our consuls in these dominions, was subject to my drafts in the hands of the Barings, Brothers and company, our bankers in London. This was a most inappropriate duty with which to charge the minister, and from which, I believe, he has of late years been absolved. The chief expenditures of the consuls were, indeed, in advancement of a highly useful policy in the government of the United States; viz., the support and relief of destitute, or distressed, American seamen in any of the ports of Great Britain or Ire-

land. Without consulting documents enabling me to be accurate, I should probably be within bounds in saying, that the aggregate of my payments to all these consuls in the course of a single year, sometimes exceeded twenty thousand dollars.

May 11. Dined with the Spanish Ambassador, the duke of San Carlos. The dinner was given to the Marquis and Marchioness Latour Maubourg. All the diplomatic corps; the duke of Wellington; Count Chickanaro; Mr. Hamilton, one of the under secretaries of State for the Foreign Department, and several others were of the company. With the duke of San Carlos, I had an exchange of congratulations on the prospect of seeing Spain and the United States placed, by the late treaty of Florida, upon friendly terms, though the treaty is yet unratified. His approach to me for this purpose a minute or two after I entered the room, as his guest, was with a grace noticed by some of the diplomatic corps; none of whom, probably, were strangers to the diplomatic coolness between the two nations at Washington, before the treaty was concluded. All see in this ambassador, from the still proud old court of Madrid, a high specimen of the Spanish gentleman.

At dinner, I was next to the Neapolitan Minister,

and Mr. Hamilton. Amongst other topicks, we had that of the Persian Ambassador's visit to London. Mr. Hamilton supposed, that one of the objects was, to obtain, through the good offices of England, some modification of a treaty of peace concluded a few years ago, between Persia and Russia, which Sir Gore Ouseley, then English Ambassador in Persia, aided in negotiating under the mediation of England. The treaty was a good one for English and Russian interests at that time, Russia being at war with Persia, but on the eve of her great struggle against the French in 1812, inasmuch as it liberated some seventy thousand Russian troops from Asiatic objects; but experience showing that some parts of the treaty were likely to bear hard upon Persia, a mitigation of the terms was sought by her, through the instrumentality of England.

I had conversation in the drawing-room with Mr. Ramadani, Chargé d'Affairs from Constantinople, on our admission to the commerce of the Black Sea. I adverted to the reciprocal advantages which might be expected to flow from opening commercial intercourse by treaty, between the United States and Turkey. Britain, France, Russia and Austria, having the privilege of sending their vessels to the Black Sea, I reminded him that the United States had a larger foreign commerce than any one of these

nations—Britain excepted; and might, therefore, as I thought, for reasons operating both with his country and mine, naturally seek participation in the trade of that sea. He listened with apparent attention to what I said, but was backward in reply, having no instructions from his court on the subject. In the course of our conversation he mentioned that Turkey had diplomatic representatives only in London, Paris and Vienna.*

The Portuguese Chargé d'Affairs, Chevalier Guerreiro, manifesting a desire to know the intentions of the United States respecting Buenos Ayres, I informed him of the probable recognition of the independence of that new state at an early day, by my government; a communication which, I thought, he received with satisfaction. He then informed me, that Count Palmella, who was in Paris on the affair of Montevideo, had little hope of succeeding in the object of his visit; and that the grand armament fitting out at Cadiz against Montevideo, was getting ready to sail with all expedition, or making demonstrations to that effect. The Chevalier appeared under no alarm at the threatened hostility of Spain, and referred with complacency to

* The treaty of Adrianople brought about by the arms of Russia in 1829, in her war against Turkey, had the effect of throwing open the commerce of the Black Sea to other nations.

the treaty between Portugal and England, in which the latter guaranties the European possessions of Portugal.

I had also conversation with Count Chickanaro, President of the Academy of Arts at Vienna, and author of the work on ancient and modern sculpture; who spoke in high commendation of the talents and acquirements of Mr. Ticknor, of Boston, whom he had met in Italy.

May 12. Yesterday the Marquis of Lansdowne made his promised motion in the House of Lords for ministers to produce the correspondence between the two governments in the cases of Arbuthnot and Ambrister. After debate, it was negatived without a division. His lordship spoke with his usual ability and dignity, but not without misapprehension as to some parts of our system of government and law; particularly our Act of Congress relative to private citizens who carry on correspondence with foreign governments; and also as to our articles of war relating to courts martial.

The United States were sufficiently put in the right on the broad merits of the transaction by the ministers of the crown, Lord Liverpool and Lord Bathurst, who spoke in reply to Lord Lansdowne. It is satisfactory to remark that the grounds upon

which they justified England in abstaining from interference, are the same in effect with those which, in fulfilment of my instructions, I had laid before the British Cabinet, as seen in the 22d chapter of the former volume of this work. I need say no more on a subject which, under some of its aspects, was painful; a subject which called for wisdom and firmness in the King's ministers to get the better of a wide-spread clamor in England, when news of the execution of those two men first arrived; and which, gathering aggravation from the power and passion of the British press, which knew not the merits of the transaction, threatened, for a short time, to interrupt the peace of the two countries. Happily, it went off without any such consequences. They would, indeed, have been far too momentous for the occasion; yet how often have nations been thrown into collision through slighter causes? History is full of such examples. The progress of the transaction cost me much solicitude, and I hailed, with unmingled satisfaction, its favorable issue.

May 14. I have a request from Mr. Hamilton, to refer him to all our Acts of Congress for maintaining more effectually our neutral relations; but chiefly the act known to have been intended for Spain and her colonies, though general in its terms,

I accordingly send it to him, being the Act of the 20th of April, 1818; and give him references to our earlier acts, particularly the Act of June, 1794, passed when the wars of the French Revolution were raging, and complaints were made by one or other of the belligerents, that privateers were fitted out in our ports, and other armaments prepared within our jurisdiction. The motive for Mr. Hamilton's request may be seen in yesterday's proceedings in the House of Commons. It appears that the Attorney General has asked leave to bring in a bill, called the Foreign Enlistment Bill, the object of which is to prevent, as far as possible, in future, the departure from British ports of any men, or military supplies, for the Spanish colonies. England is thus going at last to try the effect of special legislation on this subject, with a declaration from Lord Castlereagh, made in the House of Commons, that his Majesty's Ministers owed an apology to the House and country, for not adopting the measure sooner. I was not prepared to see him go to this extent in his declaration; nor for the measure itself, which must have been the effect of a recent determination. The policy of it may, perhaps, be called generous, considering the weakness of Spain, and how fast she is tottering to a fall from her colonial power. This, none can see more clearly, than the English

Ministers. The measure may have been urged on by the course of the United States, in determining to recognise Buenos Ayres. Whether a special Act of Parliament can stop supplies, and thence also the complaints from the Duke of San Carlos to which Lord Melville alluded, at the Portuguese ambassador's in February, time will show.

It is among the permanent instructions to me from my government to keep all our ministers, at whatever places we may have them, in Europe or America, informed of any events coming under my knowledge in London, which may bear upon any part of our foreign relations, or otherwise be interesting to the United States. Thus broadly did Mr. Adams view diplomatic duty under this, as all aspects; and it may be in place here to say, that I made known to Mr. Erving, our minister at Madrid, my communication to Lord Castlereagh in February, of the intention of the United States to recognise the Independence of Buenos Ayres. I was also informed by Mr. Erving, that the knowledge of it had been transmitted to the English Embassy at Madrid, by a courier extraordinary from London. This will manifest the interest which the English Court took in that communication, as well as the relations of amity which bound England to Spain; and thence, also, may render it the less difficult to imagine a motive for the Foreign Enlistment

bill, which the ministers at last determined to pass.

May 18. Went to a party last night at the Countess of Jersey's, Berkley Square. The rooms presented a large array of Whig nobility; amongst them, some of the most enlightened men of England. I went afterwards to Countess Grosvenor's, where a party still larger was assembled. Four rooms were open, the walls of each covered with paintings, Grosvenor House being celebrated for its large collection. I could do no more than glance at them last night, seeing them better on subsequent occasions. In the principal room, a large one and very lofty, and which from abundant light had a sun-like brightness, were four large paintings by Reubens—scripture pieces, besides other productions of the masters. These four, I was informed, had been recently purchased by Lord Grosvenor, for five thousand pounds sterling. In another of the rooms, my attention was called by one of the guests, to a landscape by Paul Potter, small in size, for which it was said a thousand guineas were given.—There were historical pieces, fancy pieces, family pieces, landscapes, portraits, making the walls on all sides glow with this rich and beautiful collection of works of art. On the sideboard and tables where refreshments stood, massive plate arrested

the eye; whilst from another of the rooms which looked into the gardens, you saw lamps through foliage and flowers, and heard music from bands. It was near two o'clock when we got home from this attractive entertainment.

CHAPTER VI.

AUTOGRAPH LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT TO THE PRINCE REGENT.—EMIGRANTS FROM ENGLAND TO THE UNITED STATES.—DINNER AT MR. WILLIAM VAUGHAN'S. —DINNER AT MR. INGLIS'S.—MR. WILBERFORCE.—DR. JOHNSON.—DINNER AT THE SPANISH AMBASSADOR'S.—LEVEE AT CARLTON HOUSE.—SPECIAL AUDIENCE OF THE PRINCE REGENT.—CONVERSATION ON AMERICAN INTERESTS AT THE LEVEE.

May 19. Having received from the Secretary of State an autograph letter addressed by the President to the Prince Regent, in answer to one addressed by the Prince to the President, announcing the death of the Queen, I wrote the following note to Lord Castlereagh.

London, May 19, 1819,
51, Baker Street.

My Lord,

I have received from the Secretary of State, a letter addressed by the President of the

United States to His Royal Highness, the Prince Regent, in answer to one from His Royal Highness to the President, dated the sixteenth of November last.

Having the President's directions to deliver this letter, a copy of which is enclosed, I have to request that your lordship will be so good as to ask on my behalf the honor of a special audience of his Royal Highness, or inform me in what other manner it may be the pleasure of His Royal Highness that it should be presented.

I have the honor to be, with
distinguished consideration,
your Lordship's
obedient Servant,
RICHARD RUSH.

The Right Honorable
Lord Viscount Castlereagh,
His Majesty's principal
Secretary of State for
Foreign Affairs.

May 21. Receive the following in reply:

The undersigned, His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Mr. Rush's letter of the 19th instant, enclosing the copy of a letter of con-

dolence from the President of the United States to his Royal Highness the Prince Regent, on the death of Her late Majesty the Queen; and requesting an audience of his Royal Highness for the purpose of delivering the original.

The undersigned hastens to acquaint Mr. Rush, that the Prince Regent will grant him an audience for that purpose on the next Levee day; and requests he will accept the assurances of his high consideration.

CASTLEREAGH.

Foreign Office,
May, 1819.

May 21. Few subjects continue to press more frequently, and I add needlessly, upon my time in this capital, sometimes by personal applications, but oftener by letters, than that of emigration to the United States. I am heavily tasked for information on this subject; sometimes even called upon to give advice! The subjoined answer, sent to-day, to one of these applications, is given, as illustrative of the mode in which I deal with all.

Legation of the United States,
London, May 21, 1819.

SIR,

I received your letter of yesterday's date, and have to say, that I have no authority to treat with you

upon the subject to which it relates. The United States have never heretofore, by any direct or indirect interference on the part of their government, invited emigrants from other countries to their shores. Their laws, it is true, are in a high degree liberal towards the foreigner, giving him full protection on his arrival, and clothing him afterwards with the rights of a citizen upon easy terms. But they leave him wholly to his own impulse whether to go or not, abstaining from all engagements or promises with him beforehand, beyond those which their permanent laws imply. I am not at present aware of any considerations connected with the late acquisition of the Floridas, to authorize an expectation that there will be any departure by the United States from this, their habitual, course of policy; and, therefore, I do not think it necessary, even if I felt at liberty, to transmit your proposals to my government. The climate and soil of those provinces, may indeed favour the cultivation of the articles you have mentioned; but this has already been more or less the case with other parts of the territorial dominion of the United States.

In affording you this early and unreserved answer, I have the honor to remain

Your obedient servant,

RICHARD RUSH.

To MR. MELTON.

May 25. Yesterday we dined with Mr. William Vaughan, residing at Clapham, a merchant of great worth, long and well known for his kindness and hospitalities to Americans. To me and my family, they were extended with great cordiality and warmth.

The party consisted of a few of his neighbors, all my family, and Mr. and Mrs. * * *, a well informed couple, who gave to conversation a sprightly and, in part, literary turn. They had recently been to Brighton, the sea-shore residence of the Prince Regent, and visited the Pavilion, a sort of marine palace built by the Regent; of the classic architecture of which fame, it is true, does not give the best account, being fashioned after Chinese models, or that of the Kremlin at Moscow; or partaking of both. With the mention of this building, the Prince Regent himself became a topick, and was spoken of without any great reserve; the disposition to do which, is not uncommon when his name comes upon the tapis, out of government circles, and those favorable to the ministry. There is no rule to which I hold myself more strictly, than that of not intermingling with party politics in this kingdom. Silence is my resource on any signs of that kind of conversation breaking out; more especially when members of the government or court to which I am accredited, are aimed at. Our benignant host

seconded my reserve on this occasion, and the topick was not much extended, but gave way to others in which all were able to share.

In the dining-room of Mr. Vaughan stood a piece of furniture in which, as a Briton, he naturally took pride; and which every body might look at with curiosity. It was a side-board formerly belonging to Lord Nelson, which he informed us he had purchased at a sale after his death.

May 28. Visit the Duke of Kent at Kensington Palace, and afterwards go to dinner at Mr. Inglis's,* Battersea Rise, West End of Clapham Common. Lord and Lady Compton, Mr. Wilberforce, Sir Thomas Ackland, Mr. and Mrs. Morier, Mr. Stratford Canning and others were of the company. The name of Ackland brings historical recollections to an American that border on romance, recalling the sufferings and dangers of that devoted wife and heroine, Lady Harriet Ackland, told in so touching a way by General Burgoyne, in his narrative of the surrender and misfortunes of his army at Saratoga. The gentleman of our party, was the present head of the ancient family in Devonshire to which the husband of Lady Harriet Ackland belonged.

* Since Sir Robert Harry Inglis, Bart.

Mr. Wilberforce had much of the conversation, all appearing to desire that he should lead it. Sir Thomas Ackland, Lord Compton, and Mr. Inglis, were well able to sustain and draw him out. He told anecdotes of Mr. Windham; said that he had left behind him numerous manuscript books made up of loose memoranda, political and literary, various journals begun and discontinued, with other occasional notes and reflections growing out of his active parliamentary life; the whole showing great labour—but never the steady pursuit of it: "that deficiency," he added, in his musical intonations of voice, "which stops short so many men capable of the greatest achievements." Speaking of the administration of justice, he said, that he looked upon the custom of men of independent estates in the country becoming justices of the peace, and doing all the duties of the office without fee or reward, as that part of their system in England from which consequences the most beneficial were constantly, though silently, flowing. "Mischief always made a noise," he said; and sometimes a case of oppression was charged upon some one or other among the magistrates of this description, which may in fact have happened; but he believed the good which, as a body, they did throughout the whole country,

incalculably predominated over any occasional mischief.*

The evening was rich in topicks in which all took part, as the wine went round, or rather as it seemed forgotten. Johnson's life and character were among them; and I might have been surprised to learn that Mr. Wilberforce knew nothing of Johnson personally, although they were contemporary, if I had, not remarked since being in England, how separate, as a class, their public and parliamentary men, however literary, as well as private persons who are literary, are from the class of authors. The cause becomes obvious when you get a close view of the multiplied subdivisions of society in London. English statesmen and orators, and men of literary attainments in that large class where permanent fortunes are possessed, pursue literature as an accomplishment. To some of the former, it is the necessary auxiliary of public life; strength alone, in the vast competition of strong minds, not being sufficient without something in addition. To the mere men of fortune, literature becomes, very largely, the necessary ornament of private life, so many persons having permanent wealth that it ceases to be a title

* The same kind of magistracy prevails in the State of Virginia, where respectable and independent citizens discharge the duties of justices of the peace without pay or reward.

to any desirable distinction in the higher classes, unless in alliance with accomplishments. But the professional author pursues literature as a profession, and is in a class of his own. A more marked illustration of the separation of the two classes could not easily be selected, perhaps, than that such a man as Mr. Wilberforce should never have met Dr. Johnson, both being social in their habits; Johnson, it is true, being in advanced life, (though he was still in full fame, writing his Lives of the Poets,) and Wilberforce in early life; at which epoch to each it was, that they were contemporary. Their political creed was also much the same.

There is doubtless more of approximation now, between these two classes in England, than in Johnson's time, and prior to his time. Their still nearer approach might improve authors in their intercourse with the world, and strengthen literature and science in the circles of influence and power; each class lending aid to the other, as in all intercourse among the enlightened.

May 29. Went to see the cork models in Lower Grosvenor Street. There was a representation of the amphitheatre at Verona, and that of Rome; of Virgil's tomb; of the cascade near Tivoli; of the grotto of Egeria; of Vesuvius in a state of eruption, and various other things of antiquity. I rank it

among the curious exhibitions I have happened to see in London. The Neapolitan minister had drawn my attention to it by remarking that representations of the ancient buildings of Italy, were thought to be better in cork than perhaps any other material,—particularly of the color of some of them; a sort of duskiness, or brown this side of it.

May 30. Dine at the Spanish Ambassador's. It was a sumptuous entertainment given in honor of his Sovereign's birth-day. The entire diplomatic corps were present; also the Duke and Duchess of Wellington; Sir Benjamin Bloomfield, chief Secretary of the Prince Regent;* some Spaniards of note —military officers chiefly; the ladies of all the ambassadors and ministers, and other prominent persons.

I had Prince Esterhazy on one side of me, and on the other Sir Benjamin Bloomfield. The former reiterated the wishes he had expressed to me on former occasions, for the opening of diplomatic intercourse between Austria and the United States. He spoke of the pending discussions in Paris between Spain and Portugal, and thought that they would come to nothing, Spain relying too much on

* Afterwards Lord Bloomfield, British Minister at Stockholm.

her own own exertions without the ability to make them effective. He told me that Lord Castlereagh had made him acquainted with my communication to him of the intention of the United States to recognise Buenos Ayres, and seemed desirous to know whether I supposed our acquisition of the Floridas, would change that intention. I said I had no belief that it would; but added that I had an impression, that our acquisition of them, coupled with our intention to recognise Buenos Ayres, had induced England to her late determination, to pass the Foreign Enlistment Bill, as something in favor of Spain, nominally at least; remarking further, that this was only a conjecture, as I had heard nothing of the sort from this government, and had no right to inquire. In speaking thus, I desired to invite some communication from him on the subject, knowing his intimate relations with the English government and court; but either he knew nothing, or was not at liberty to let me hear it. He remarked, that he thought it natural in the United States to contemplate the recognition of Buenos Ayres; and said, that whatever differences of opinion might exist as to the principle of the struggle going on in Spanish America, nothing seemed more certain to all observers out of Spain, than that it must end,

sooner or later, in the separation of the colonies from the parent state.

In conversation with the French Ambassador in the drawing-rooms, I alluded to the good wishes, if not good offices, of M. Hyde de Neuville, French Minister at Washington, in aid of our treaty for the Floridas; upon which he asked if the British Government had complained of our acquisition of these provinces. I said, not to me.

June 3. Attended the Levee, and had my audience of the Prince Regent, as promised by Lord Castlereagh, for the purpose of delivering an autograph letter of condolence from the President, on the death of the late Queen. The audience took place before the general Levee commenced, and in the Regent's private apartment, or closet. Lord Graves was in waiting to introduce me. In the room with the Prince, I found Lord Castlereagh. I delivered the original letter to the Prince, saying that it was in answer to one which His Royal Highness wrote to the President on the afflicting occasion of the death of her late Majesty, the Queen; and that in delivering it I had the President's commands to say, that, taking an interest in whatever affected the happiness of His Royal Highness and that of his illustrious house, he had received the in-

telligence with deep regret, and desired to offer his sincere condolence to His Royal Highness. I added words respectful towards the virtues and character of the Queen, such as appeared appropriate.

The Prince seemed to feel what I said in the name of the executive head of my country, of the Queen, his mother. He replied, that he was much indebted to the President for sentiments so obliging; it was indeed true, that her Majesty had been remarkable throughout life for her virtues; that none had known her worth as well as her family, and that they, therefore, had been naturally most afflicted at the loss; and not one of them more than himself. The interview here closed. On coming out, I observed that the Persian Ambassador was waiting for an audience after mine was over. In full oriental costume and glittering with gems, he entered the Regent's apartment as I left it.

The Levee afforded the opportunity of attending to other public duty. The President of the Board of Trade was there, and I renewed with all earnestness my application relative to the extra duties. He gave me assurances that he was devising a mode by which I might feel satisfied, the American ship owners would no longer be called upon to pay them; he found that an act of parliament would be necessary, and he added that he would

make it his particular care to have it carried through at the present session.

I had also a conversation with Lord Bathurst, the Secretary of State for colonial affairs, on the subject of the outrage upon the American Consul at Tripoli. He said, unhesitatingly, that the shelter afforded to the offenders by the British Consul in manner alleged, if such had been the fact, was as far from being under orders from the British Government, as from any wishes which it could possibly entertain on such an occasion; he was totally unacquainted with the transaction, but added that he would cause proper inquiry to be made into it, and have such steps taken as might be necessary. After so unequivocal a disclaimer from two cabinet ministers, one of them the foreign secretary, this matter, under my present instructions, will now rest.

CHAPTER VII.

MARRIAGES OF THE DUKES OF CAMBRIDGE, CLARENCE AND KENT.—FORMS BETWEEN GOVERNMENTS ON SUCH OCCASIONS.—DRAWING-ROOM ON THE PRINCE REGENT'S BIRTH-DAY.—COURT FORMS.—RUMORS OF MINISTERIAL CHANGES.—INTERVIEW WITH LORD CASTLEREAGH ON THE WEST INDIA TRADE.—RUMORS ABOUT CUBA.—DINNER AT THE RUSSIAN AMBASSADOR'S.—PRINCE REGENT'S DRAWING ROOM.—DINNER AT LORD CASTLEREAGH'S.—THE RUMOR ABOUT CUBA.—LORD CASTLEREAGH PAYS A COMPLIMENT TO THE UNITED STATES.

According to form, I had furnished Lord Castlereagh with a copy of the autograph Letter from the President to the Prince Regent, delivered at the audience described in the preceding chapter, but did not retain one myself. Having a copy of one delivered formerly, similar in purport, though not in the occasion calling it forth, for the incidents were those of gladness, not grief, I will here give it insertion. It was a letter from the President to the Prince Re-

gent in answer to two letters addressed to him by the Prince, announcing the marriages of the dukes of Cambridge, Clarence, and Kent. In the insertion of this document, which is on the Archives of both governments, there can be nothing improper. It is, in its nature, public; and time seems now almost to have invested it with an historical character. It may serve to make known a little more largely the form and spirit in which the executive heads of nations, a Republic being one, address each other directly, when there is no intervention of secretaries or ministers. The words which sovereigns, and those who represent sovereignty, use on these occasions, if only words, are, on their face, benignant; and such words, fitly spoken, we are told, are as "apples of gold in pictures of silver." I gave in chapter eighth of the former volume, an autograph letter which shows how heads of nations address each other, when charging their representatives with the transaction of grave matters of international concern. The letter now inserted, may serve as a sample of the mode in which courteousness and good-will are reciprocated between them, in the sphere of personality. Here is the copy of the letter:

To His Royal Highness, the Prince Regent, acting in the name and on behalf of His Majesty, the King of The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

Our Great and Good Friend,

I have received two letters which your Royal Highness was so good as to address to the United States, dated the first and twelfth of July last, by which your Royal Highness was pleased to communicate to us information of the nuptials of their Royal Highnesses, your much respected Brothers, the Dukes of Cambridge, Clarence, and Kent. The Duke of Cambridge with her serene Highness, the Princess Augusta Wilhelmina Louisa, of Hesse Cassel; The Duke of Clarence, with her serene Highness, the Princess Adelaide Louisa-Catherine, of Saxe Meinengen; and the Duke of Kent, with her Serene Highness, Victoria Maria Louisa, of Saxe Coburg; all recently solemnized at the Queen's Palace. Feeling a sincere and lively interest in the happiness of Your Royal Highness and of your august family, I offer to your Royal Highness on these joyful events, my cordial congratulations; and I earnestly pray that they may be productive of the

truest felicity to the parties themselves, and of permanent benefits to the British nation.

I pray God, great and good friend,
to have you always in his holy keeping.

JAMES MONROE.

Written at Washington, this third day of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighteen, and of the independence of the United States, the forty-third.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.
Secretary of State.

From one of these marriages has sprung a Queen who now reigns over the British Realm. From that fair stock is likely to spring a race of sovereigns: And may not all breathe hopes in unison with this autograph letter of President Monroe? Besides the "permanent benefits to the British nation," for which that wise and good man, and sterling patriot, expressed his wish, while conveying his congratulations on the marriage of the Duke of Kent, may not all hope, that it may tend also to the benefit of the family of nations? The wish, or prayer, as given out by President Monroe, if but a formulary, is also enlightened; for the prosperity of

one great nation, is that of others. England's prosperity flows over upon us, as ours upon England; and thus, international courtesy, when assuming this form, embodies international wisdom.

June 4. Receive a note from Sir Robert Chester, the master of ceremonies, informing me that the Prince Regent's birth-day would be kept on the 17th of this month, and that a drawing-room would be held on that day. Regular notices of this kind from the court, are sent to the Foreign Ambassadors and Ministers, although the ceremonials of which they give information, are always announced in the newspapers. I give a copy of his note:

Sir Robert Chester presents his compliments to Mr. Rush, and has the honor to acquaint him that the Prince Regent's birth-day will be kept on Thursday the 17th instant; when his Royal Highness will hold a drawing-room at Buckingham House.

68 South Audley Street,
June 2, 1819.

P.S. Carriage tickets for Constitution Hill will be sent to the Foreign Ambassadors and Ministers the day before the drawing-room.

I acknowledged the note as follows:

Mr. Rush presents his compliments to Sir Robert Chester, and has the honor to return his thanks for the information he has been so good as to send him of its being intended to keep the birth-day of the Prince Regent on the 17th instant, and that His Royal Highness will hold a drawing-room on that day at Buckingham House.

The postscript to the note, has reference to a carriage entrance into St. James's Park, through a gate-way from which are excluded all other carriages, unless the owners have some personal privilege, or hold some station, giving them the claim to it. This seems a small detail on paper; but it may serve to illustrate that remark in Burke's speech on economical reform and retrenchment, where, in the midst of his pruning, he is still for retaining those stations intended, as he says, "for the public decorum, and for preserving the grace and majesty of a great people." Since being in England I have chanced to hear a gentleman of consideration give expression to regrets at having resigned a situation in the household of the Queen,—simply because it had lost his carriage the privilege of going to Levees and drawing-rooms by Constitution Hill! I add, that to Foreign Ambassadors and Ministers, the

privilege is very convenient, from the multitude of carriages which, on these occasions, throng other approaches to the Palace.

June 7. * * * * * *, of the diplomatic corps, paid me a visit. He talked on several subjects. He thinks there is something in the wind about a change of ministry. He said that the Duke of Bedford, the Earl of Besborough, and the Earl of Darlington, all whigs, dined with the Prince Regent yesterday, a circumstance which has not occurred for a long time before. It seems that the Duke of Bedford was at Brighton lately, where he had gone for the benefit of his health. The Prince Regent being there, sent a message to inquire how he was. In return, the Duke called at the Pavillion, and inscribed his name in the Prince's book. No intercourse had for some years passed between the parties. On coming to town, the Prince sent for the Duke and kept him in conversation a couple of hours at Carlton House, saying, as he was going away, that he had not for a long time been so happy as in the renewal of a friendship which he had formerly prized so much. He afterwards gave him a special invitation to dinner, joining with him the friends above named. My visiter exercised his ingenuity for a key to all this, which, he said, excites attention. He summed up with saying, that if no

general change be in contemplation just now, which, however, he rather inclined to believe, the Prince must design to give some of his ministers "the fidgets," possibly from having been thwarted in some of his wishes; and as he also assured me that the affair was a topick in prominent circles, and believed in some of them not to be without meaning, I make a note of what he said.

By as much as I can see, or learn, the present ministry appears to be as strong throughout the country, as in Parliament. To my vision, there are no signs of change; and it is so that I write to my government. The prudence and firmness of Lord Liverpool as Premier, seem pledges for the stability of the ministry; not to speak of the weight it acquired by being the ministry in power when Napoleon was overthrown. It was to this effect that I talked to my visiter. I said also, that, to my speculative observation, a tory administration seemed rather the most in unison with a country, the institutions of which were essentially aristocratical and monarchical; just as in the United States, where our constitutions began with the words "we the people," where suffrage was nearly universal, and nearly every office elective, or depending on the issue of elections, democratic administrations seemed the most natural; and I added, that tory administrations in England had been found to treat us best.

My visiter and I discoursed of these things in good part; he, as a monarchist, I, as a republican.

June 9. We were at a rout at Mrs. Henry Baring's last night, Berkely Square.

An American present, bore hard upon the United States. What was said, was little to the advantage of the head or heart of the speaker. I will not repeat or comment upon it. It is the first instance of the kind I have yet met with from an American in England; and let it be hoped that they were only sallies of the moment—words spoken, but not meant.

June 10. Last night we went to Covent Garden, to see Mrs. Siddons in Lady Randolph. Her fame had been familiar to me from youth; her appearance upon the stage is still imposing, I may say, superb; though of late years she has ceased to act almost entirely. Her enunciation was highly eloquent and impressive. Charles Kemble played Young Norval; Macready, Glenalvon; and Young, the Stranger. Altogether, it was a dramatic treat.

June 13. Desiring to see Lord Castlereagh on the business of the West India Trade, I wrote him the following note:

Mr. Rush presents his compliments to Lord Castlereagh, and begs he will be so good as to appoint a time when it will be convenient to afford him the honor of an interview.

June 9, 1819.
51 Baker Street.

To which I received the following answer:

Lord Castlereagh presents his compliments to Mr. Rush, and will be happy to receive him at his house, in St. James's Square, to-morrow at twelve o'clock.

Foreign Office,
June 12, 1819.

The interview accordingly took place to-day, the thirteenth. It was the mode in which all official interviews with us were appointed, unless, meeting in society, we arranged them verbally.

I began by reminding him of the point at which the discussions respecting the West India Trade had left off at the negotiation between our two governments last autumn, and by assuring him of the President's earnest desire to see the trade opened upon a footing of entire and liberal reciprocity, rather than suffer it to stagnate; or to be crippled by countervailing laws and regulations. In this spirit I was instructed to offer a projet which had been carefully drawn up upon the basis of a compromise

between the pretensions of the two countries, and which would be found to fall in so fully with the propositions of Great Britain in some respects, and make such an approximation to them in others, that a hope was cherished by my government of its proving acceptable.

In particular, it would be found to adopt the description of naval stores and lumber, as articles to be exported from the United States, upon which the British plenipotentiaries had themselves insisted last autumn; confining the former to pitch, tar, and turpentine, and the latter to staves, heading and shingles; contrary to the more enlarged signification which it had been the desire of Mr. Gallatin and myself to give to the list. That it acquiesced also in the exclusion of all salted provisions, including the important article of fish. That it moreover came wholly into the British views in consenting to the exclusion of sugar and coffee, as articles to be imported into the United States directly from the British West Indies; it being understood that the above traffic was to be open upon equal terms in all respects, to American and British vessels.

In return for such an accommodation to the colonial views of Great Britain, the projet asked on our side, that the list of articles to be exported from the United States to the West Indies, should be the

same as to Bermuda, and to the British North American colonies; that the articles to be exported to the United States, should be confined to such as were of the growth, produce or manufacture of the above islands or colonies; and that the same duties and no more, should be payable on importations from the United States into the West Indies, whether the articles were brought directly or indirectly, as on similar articles imported into the West Indies from any foreign country; or from any of the British colonies.

With this outline of the substantial parts of its contents, I handed his lordship a copy of the projet.

The discussions between the plenipotentiaries of the two governments last autumn, having been ample on the matters which the projet embraced, I thought nothing was likely to be gained by leaving room for the hope that any of its essential provisions would be departed from; and I therefore deemed it best to say with frankness in the first instance, that, as it was offered, so it was to be taken; as my present instructions would not allow me to deviate from it, unless on points verbal or otherwise immaterial.

He received it with an assurance that a full and candid consideration would be given to it. The pressure of parliamentary business might, he said,

delay an attention to it perhaps for some weeks; but it should be taken up at as early a day as practicable. I said that every necessary object would be attained on our side if a decision were communicated to me in time to be made known to my government before the meeting of Congress, which would take place early in December. I added, that should our propositions prove acceptable, I was empowered to make them supplementary to the convention of the twentieth of October, which Mr. Gallatin and I had signed with the plenipotentiaries of Great Britain; subject always to the ratification of the Senate of the United States.

There were no other express matters of business necessary to be gone into at this interview; but before it ended, I adverted to other things. Amongst them, the state of the Foreign Enlistment bill in the House of Commons, which his lordship gave me to understand left no doubt of its becoming a law; and next, the rumors about Cuba. On the latter I remarked, that I should be under no anxiety if the newspapers had not ascribed to the Duke of San Carlos, the declaration that it was about to be added to His Britannic Majesty's colonial dominions in America—but I hoped the newspapers were mistaken! His lordship replied, that the Duke of San Carlos probably knew as little of it as he did.

The Foreign Enlistment bill finally did pass both Houses of Parliament, but not without strong opposition, on the ground of trenching too much on the regular laws of England, and on public law; and as not called for by England's Treaty with Spain, or any of her international duties or obligations.

June 15. Dined at the Russian Ambassador's. We had, among others, Mr. and Mrs. Dashkoff, lately arrived from the United States, where Mr. Dashkoff was Minister Plenipotentiary from Russia. Went next to a rout, at the Persian Ambassador's, in Charles Street, where five hundred were present; and, afterwards to a party at Lansdowne House, more agreeable from being smaller.

June 17. Attended the Prince Regent's drawing-room. It was extremely full; three thousand were said to have been there. It was a birth-day celebration, though not the actual anniversary as mentioned formerly.

I presented General Harper, of Maryland, and late of the United States Senate, to the Prince Regent; also to the Duke of Kent, and the Princess Augusta; happy to have done so in the case of this distinguished American.

The Duke and Duchess of Bedford, the Duke of Grafton, the Marquis of Lansdowne, and Earl Grosvenor were present; which, to those inclined to think any change of ministry in contemplation, as * * * * * * * *, ten days ago when he paid me a visit, might be taken as omens; the two first not having been at court for years, it is said, and the others coming very seldom.

At seven, I went to the large dinner given by Lord Castlereagh to the Foreign Ambassadors and Ministers in celebration of the day. France, Austria, Russia, Prussia, Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands, Saxony, Wirtemberg, Spain, Portugal, Naples, Sardinia, and some of the smaller courts, were represented at the table, each ambassador and minister being in the diplomatic dress of his country. There were also present, two Princes of Hesse; Count Woronzoff; General Woronzoff, the latter commander in chief of the late Russian army of occupation in France; Sir Gore Ousely, late ambassador from England to Persia; Mr. Bagot, late British Minister at Washington; Mr. Lamb, late British Minister at Munich; Mr. Frere, the same at Madrid; Mr. Thornton, the same at Rio Janiero; Mr. Onis, late Spanish Minister at Washington; Lord Clanwilliam; Mr. Planta; Mr. Morier, and Mr. Hamilton. Altogether, there was an assemblage

of functionaries from other nations, and of British Foreign Ministers returned from service abroad, or at home on leave, larger than I had before seen on any similar occasion in England.

We went to dinner a little before eight, according to the precedence observed at entertainments of this nature. At table, I had on my left, the Saxon Minister, Baron Just. On my right, was Baron Fagel, ambassador from the Netherlands. Next to him sat Lord Castlereagh, who on this occasion took the middle of his table. On his right, was Count Lieven, the Russian ambassador, and next to him, Prince Esterhazy, the Austrian. Amidst the profusion of plate for such a dinner, some of it, I observed, had the Royal arms, but generally those of Lord Castlereagh's family. The table ornaments, abundant light, and variegated national costumes, presented, as we took our seats, an array very striking. It might have given the idea of a European Congress for that evening, to which the United States had been also invited.

Baron Just inquired of me for Mr. Adams, whom he had known well, and of whom he spoke highly. He said that he knew the politics of all Europe. He described his letter to our minister at Madrid on the cases of Arbuthnot and Ambrister, as one of great ability in its defence of the whole conduct of

the American general, and policy of our government; and asked, whether, after the execution of those two British subjects, followed up by adding the Floridas to our dominion, I did not suppose England would be likely to aim at obtaining Cuba from Spain, if she had not already, of which there were strong rumors? This question was in a tone, not to carry it beyond my ear. *Mr. Onis* sat on the left of Baron Just; and I said to the latter, that I would be happy if he would make that inquiry of his neighbor and favor *me* with the result! The Baron did—carrying the question off well. Mr. Onis said, just loud enough for me to hear, "the American Minister may feel easy—Spain has not ceded Cuba to England—and does not mean to;" an item of information which, however informally derived, it may be imagined the American Minister imparted to his government in due time afterwards.

And now I will allude to an incident which also couples itself with the "American Minister;" yet in a light so national, that he must not drop it from this day's memorandum.

After the principal courses were over, and the single toast had been given by Lord Castlereagh, viz., "His Royal Highness the Prince Regent," without further word or comment, the company all rising in due form as he gave it, conversation opened

between his Lordship and Baron Fagel on the state of tranquillity which now reigned in Europe. It was remarked by them, how happily it contrasted with the bloody wars which had so recently raged; and how interesting was the spectacle of beholding ambassadors and ministers from all Europe assembled in amity and peace at that table, instead of being engaged in the work of counteracting each other, as all had so lately been doing, in hostile camps and cabinets. Sitting next to Baron Fagel, the opportunity was afforded me of sharing a little in this conversation. At its point of chief interest. Lord Castlereagh, bending forward so as to give me his voice, said, "Yes, and may the happy tranquillity we are speaking of, long continue; Europe requires repose; each state has had enough of war, and enough of glory, and ought to be content." Here he paused an instant; but, resuming, he proceeded, "and you, too, You of America, Mr. Rush, ought also to be satisfied; You left off very well, and ought to wish for nothing but a continuance of peace."

I felt this delicately conveyed compliment to my country. He knew that our war with Britain had terminated in victory on our side, by sea and land. I could not fail to perceive, that the compliment passed, in under tones, along the table, the side at

least on which I was; though it was heard at first, only by the few near Lord Castlereagh. Acceptable to me, it bespoke conscious patriotism in him. He felt that Britain's ample renown in arms could spare the compliment to the free and martial race she founded in America; therefore, with the manly grace belonging to him, he uttered it; the representatives of the crowned heads of Europe sitting by as his guests. It was high official courtesy, and I record it with as much pleasure as I experienced it.

Rising from the table, the company returned to the drawing-rooms, where coffee was handed, and conversation continued in the harmonious feeling of the day. In an hour all adjourned to Prince Esterhazy's, with a ball at whose house the festivities of this birth-day celebration wound up. The Prince Regent was at it, the ladies of all the ambassadors and ministers, with a large assemblage in addition.

CHAPTER VIII.

PARTY AT CARLTON HOUSE.—CONVERSATION ABOUT CUBA.—DINNER AT MR. GEORGE PHILLIPS'S.—DINNER AT MR. TRAIL'S.—THE BOX PRESENTED BY THE EARL OF BUCHAN TO GENERAL WASHINGTON.—NOTE FROM LORD CASTLEREAGH ON SPECIAL AUDIENCES OF THE PRINCE REGENT.—DINNER AT THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON'S.—LETTER TO MR. GALLATIN.—CUBA.—THE FLORIDA TREATY.—THE WEST INDIA TRADE.—PARTY AT GROSVENOR HOUSE.—ARRIVAL OF THE AMERICAN STEAMSHIP SAVANNAH, AT LIVERPOOL.

June 19. Went to Carlton House last night. The lower rooms were full; foreign ambassadors and ministers, members of the cabinet, members of parliament, and numerous official and titled persons, forming the company. Conversed half an hour with Lord Liverpool and Lord Harrowby on Gibbon's style, and on Bonaparte's character. Gibbon's remark that Tacitus was the first historian who had applied the science of philosophy to the study of facts, and that his work contained more ideas than words,

being mentioned, it was agreed that his own style did not illustrate the latter part of it, although the classic and uniform stateliness with which Gibbon sustained his style, had often the quality of condensation too. To another of his remarks, that the Greek language was one capable of giving soul to the objects of sense and body to the abstractions of philosophy, Lord Harrowby, who has the reputation of being a fine Greek scholar, responded very cordially. When Bonaparte was spoken of, it was plain that neither of them admired his character. They spoke as British statesmen who had been long opposed to him; nor did I think they said too much of his inordinate ambition. Taking all his career into view, they agreed, that wanton cruelty could not be made out against him.

Finding myself thus in accidental conversation with two members of the cabinet, the Premier, and the President of the council, I improved the opportunity of alluding to Cuba. I said to Lord Liverpool, I was glad to infer from some transient words falling from Lord Castlereagh, that the newspaper rumors of that island being about to change owners were not to be regarded. He replied, that newspaper rumors here, as with us, probably, were often very idle; and that if government undertook to notice them all, it would have its hands full. Al-

though he was no more explicit than this, I make the same inference from his words, as from Lord Castlereagh's; and am therefore still disposed, in the language of Mr. Onis, to "feel easy." I catch a general sentiment in the diplomatic corps, that none of the great powers would desire to see Cuba ceded to England, considering the vastness of her colonial dominion already; and I cannot think that her ministers would wish to go against this general sentiment, to say nothing of the objections which the United States would naturally have to the measure. This is the tone in which I have written to my government on this subject; and, with my present knowledge and impressions, I shall continue it.

June 20. Dined at Mr. George Phillips's yesterday, a member of the House of Commons, Mount Street. We had Mr. Brougham, Mr. Cavendish, Mr. Chinnery, Mr. Erskine, Mr. Abercrombie and other members of Parliament; and among the ladies, Mrs. Erskine and Lady Cork. The evening passed off well. Mr. Brougham contributed largely to the conversation. He talked with his usual animation and promptness. Nothing could be alluded to, which he did not seem to know; or any person mentioned of whom he was ignorant. He told anecdotes of public men, rapidly glancing at things which seemed to spring up in his memory

after he began. As, for example, speaking of Lord Chancellor Eldon, (*bags* they call him, said he, great a man as he is) and then went on with what he was saying before the parenthesis. So when he happened to have the Vice Chancellor in hand, (and he, what would they call *him*, but *reticule;*) and after thus throwing him also into a parenthesis, proceeded with his narrative proper.

June 21. Dine at Mr. Trail's, upper Brook street. We had the Earl of Buchan (to whose letter to me, Lord Erskine alluded at the Duchess' of Cumberland;) Mr. David Montague Erskine, Mrs. Erskine, and others; forming not a large company, but of good size for conversation.

With Lord Buchan the incident of the lost letter, mentioned in Chapter X. of the former volume, was not forgotten among the topicks of the evening. He also spoke kindly of my father, saying besides other things grateful to a son, that he had known him in Scotland, whilst there to receive his education, and been in correspondence with him nearly fifty years; and that nothing struck him more than the identity of character kept up throughout all his letters. He regretted the loss of the "Box," all the circumstances of which I explained.

He spoke of General Washington, as others present did, paying tributes to his great name. He

said, that he was related to him through the maternal stock, Washington's mother, like his own, being of the Fairfaxs'. The Washington family, from which the General sprung, he added, was related to the family of Earl Ferrers. Cordial things were said of our country by several of the company. Mrs. Erskine was born there; and it was delightful to find, doubly so to those who remembered her young and beautiful, as Miss Cadwalader of Philadelphia, that though a good English-woman, which her marriage made a duty, she had a heart not to forget her native land.

This estimable woman died not long since at one of the German Courts, as Lady Erskine, her husband, Lord Erskine, being at the time British Minister there.

The "Box" alluded to, was one made out of the Oak that sheltered Wallace after the battle of Falkirk. It had been presented to General Washington by the Earl of Buchan, with a request that the General would give it at his decease, to the man in his country who should appear to merit it best. General Washington did not decide that question; but in his will, restored it to the Earl, with expressions of respect and thankfulness. His lordship, having it again, sent it to my father, long his American correspondent. The gentleman charged to convey it

to him from Scotland, had the misfortune to lose it, while coming to Philadelphia from New York, where he landed, I think in 1803. The stage was robbed during the night, and his trunk, which contained the box, carried off. Every effort was made to regain it, but in vain.

June 23. Mr. and Mrs. Dashkoff, General and Mrs. Harper, Miss Caton, Mr. John Adams Smith, and others, dine with us. Conversation runs on the United States and England—Mr. Dashkoff, apparently full of good feeling towards the United States, produced by his residence among us, as minister from Russia; and General Harper giving out remarks on what has struck him in England, showing his enlightened and discriminating mind.

June 24. Receive the following note from Lord Castlereagh, on a point of ceremony:

Lord Castlereagh presents his compliments to Mr. Rush, and in consequence of the inconvenience which has occasionally arisen from the Master of the Ceremonies not being apprized in time of the wish of the Foreign ambassadors and ministers to obtain audiences of his Royal Highness the Prince Regent, begs to suggest to Mr. Rush, as the best mode of preventing such inconvenience in future, that he

should, at the same time that he intimates his request for such an audience to his Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, have the goodness to acquaint the Master of Ceremonies that he has made that communication to the Secretary of State.

Lord Castlereagh requests Mr. Rush to accept the assurances of his high consideration.

Foreign Office,
June 21, 1819.

A similar note was sent to all the members of the diplomatic corps. I reply to mine in the following terms:

Mr. Rush presents his compliments to Lord Castlereagh, and has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of his note of the 21st of this month, suggesting that in consequence of the inconvenience which has occasionally arisen from the Master of the Ceremonies not being apprized in time of the wish of the Foreign Ambassadors and Ministers to obtain audiences of his Royal Highness the Prince Regent, it would be desirable that they should, while requesting an audience through his Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, inform at the same time the Master of the Ceremonies of such request, as the best mode of preventing for the future, the inconvenience alluded to. Mr. Rush begs to say, that he will have great pleasure in conforming to

this suggestion, and has the honor to tender to Lord Castlereagh the assurances of his distinguished consideration.

London, June 24, 1819.
51, Baker Street.

June 25. Dined yesterday at the Duke of Wellington's. Besides the Duke and Duchess, we had General and Mrs. Harper, Mr. Percy, Mr. Gerald Wellesley—a brother of the Duke, and two gentlemen from the Continent. The Duke had written me a courteous note to say, that General and Mrs. Harper were to dine with him, and asking my wife and self to meet them at short notice; which we were the more happy to do, as it bespoke a dinner of less form. It was at Apsley House.

A colossal statue of Bonaparte, presented to the Duke by the King of France, stands in the hall. In the library, there was also a full length painting of him, said to be an excellent likeness; and, among other busts in the same room, one of Cicero, which the Duke spoke of as an original, as far as could be ascertained. It was of marble, showing the marks of time. The blemish, *cicer*, was observable on the face. In the drawing-room, was a likeness of Shakspeare, taken from a picture, believed to be an original, found many years ago in an old ale house in the neighborhood of Stratford upon Avon, under the paper on the wall.

It devolved upon me to take the Duchess into dinner, and the honor of sitting next to her at table was also mine. She told anecdotes of Madame de Staël, whom she had known while the Duke was ambassador at Paris after Bonaparte's overthrow. They were very characteristic of that remarkable woman, whose pen handled Napoleon in a degree only second to the Duke's sword.

The Duke was at the head of his table. The Duchess sat opposite. The former talked with the ease which a long intercourse with the world in its greatest circles, gives. The quantity of food necessary for soldiers, being spoken of, he said that he had commanded them of many different nations, and never knew any that could long subsist, under the trials of a campaign, with less than two pounds a day, whether bread of some kind altogether, or a mixture of bread with animal food; and added, that this applied to the native troops of India, who required their two pounds of rice in the twenty-four hours. Of the population of India then subject to England, he remarked, that it had always seemed to him overrated; he could not pretend to accuracy, but he doubted if it exceeded twenty millions. This struck me the more, having been under the prevalent belief that it was greatly beyond that amount. Perhaps there might be seen in the remark, a characteristic of the Duke's mind, not to

be led away by exaggerations. More conversation passed, which had the greater charm from the company being small and without ceremony, beyond that which intrinsically belonged to the table of such a man. In the course of it, a newspaper paragraph was alluded to, which mentioned a curious spectacle lately witnessed at the seat of the Marquis of Anglesey. One of the Marquis's brothers, who was a captain in the navy; Lord Uxbridge, the Marquis's son; and one of his daughters, being all at his country seat; it was stated, that the Marquis had but one leg, his brother but one arm, that his son was on crutches from a wound in the knee, and that his daughter had lost her right hand whilst attending her husband at one of the battles in Spain. The Duke said it was not true that the lady had lost her hand. The rest he believed was. We had a Spanish ham on the table. It is a common remark that each country thinks it has the best hams; but the Spanish seem preferred in England at luxurious dinners—they say from being fed on chestnuts.

At coffee in the drawing-room, the social tone seemed to become even more easy. We were shown by the Duchess, a set of French breakfast China, belonging to Joseph Bonaparte while king of Spain, which the Duke took in one of his campaigns; and under such hot pursuit, that grounds

were still in the coffee-pot, and warm. Anecdotes growing out of this little incident were told, showing the risks which royalty has to run in war; [so, also, in Pompey's days, when Cæsar took his camp, he found sideboards loaded with plate, all ready for a festival to celebrate the victory Pompey had expected!] The interest of the evening increased when General Harper and the Duke got upon Bonaparte's campaign to Moscow. My countryman was fond of military history, and no tyro in it. It became him, indeed, to speak cautiously before the Duke, as he did; but his knowledge was subservient towards drawing out a little this great commander. I was of the knot where the conversation was going on; it touched things and characters belonging to the late European wars. Amongst names brought up, was that of the Archduke Charles, of Austria. General Harper spoke favorably of him, though with guards to leave room for the Duke's opinion. The Duke took up the commendation of him, decidedly. As regarded military science, he said, that he probably had more than any general in Europe; there were reasons why he had not succeeded against Bonaparte as fully as he otherwise would have done; one perhaps was, from overrating him; but it was chiefly from being subject to fits, which were apt to come upon him, after

he had been fighting a few hours. His powers then failed him—great as they otherwise were. It was to this effect he spoke of him. Of the virtuous character and good intentions of the Emperor of Austria, he spoke in the highest terms.

So passed the evening. I had seen and conversed with the Duke frequently before; but not so fully, or when reserve had so much worn off. In his whole conversation there was a simplicity delightful to witness, in a man whose name in arms surpasses Marlborough's by the amount and splendor of his deeds both in Asia and Europe; whose knowledge is so extensive and various; and to whose statesmanship, the powers of Europe have deferred as much as to his military renown; of whom it can be said also, in a sphere of praise still higher, that, tried by the ordinary standards of great men, his career has been unusually pure; no improper ambition, no corruption of any kind, no intrigue, no discontent, no double dealing, ever chargeable upon him: on the contrary, every thing honest, straight-forward, and brave, whilst serving his country, no matter where or how. Such fame is rare. Britain has a right to be proud of it, and all nations may respect it. Before coming away, he invited my wife and self to visit him at his country estate, Strathfieldsay.

June 29. Prince Esterhazy visits me: says that by all his information, obtained here or from Madrid, there is no truth in the rumor of the cession of Cuba to England; he finds it discredited by those likely to be best informed. I agree with him in his disbelief, and in talking the subject over, our reasons are much the same.

June 30. The subjoined letter to Mr. Gallatin, relating to international affairs heretofore referred to, is inserted in connexion with them.

London, June 30, 1819.

Dear Sir,

You will probably know more of the state of affairs in Spain, as far as they may be likely to affect us, than I do. The rumor of Mr. Onis being about to succeed the Marquis Yrujo in the ministry, was afloat here on the first arrival of the former in this capital from the United States, and was even repeated by the Duke of San Carlos.

Whether the Florida Treaty is to be ratified by Spain, seems now the question; and it is one which excites some interest here. I find it surmised that this government is using its influence to prevent the ratification; but I have no evidence of it. Mr. Onis, when here, was very confident in his asser-

tions that it would be ratified. The Duke of San Carlos continues to hold language to the same effect.

The Duke is also equally unequivocal in his declarations of disbelief, that Cuba is to be ceded to Great Britain. No credit is given to this rumor in any well informed circle in London. Many reasons are opposed to it, one of which, however, would probably be weakened, should the late change of ministry in Spain have brought with it any decline of Russian influence at Madrid.

It has only been since Mr. Sheldon's arrival in London that I have heard from our government respecting the unfinished subjects of our negotiations last autumn.

As regards the West India trade, I am authorized to accept the restricted list of articles proposed by the British plenipotentiaries in their projet offered at the eighth conference; also to submit to the exclusion of all salted provisions, and to the confined list of naval stores and lumber among the importable, and to the exclusion of sugar and coffee from the list of exportable articles in American vessels, in the direct trade. But with the express condition, that the list of importable articles to the West Indies, shall be the same as that to Bermuda and to the British North American colonies; and that the ex-

portable articles shall be confined to such as are of the growth, produce or manufacture of the British West India Islands and North American colonies; and that no other or higher duties shall be payable on importations from the United States, directly or indirectly, than on similar articles imported from any foreign country, or from any of the British colonies themselves.

The foregoing is the substance of my instructions. I have submitted articles to Lord Castlereagh in conformity with them, to which an answer is promised after parliament rises. I doubt their being accepted. If they should not be, I fancy our government has made up its mind to go on with the system of countervailing laws. The opinion at home I find rather is, that we are likely to succeed if we persevere. I enclose you a report made to the senate on this subject last winter.

Nothing has been said to me about impressment, or the slave question. Both points, therefore, rest for the present, where our joint negotiation last autumn left them.

I am to be at the Spanish ambassador's to-morrow night. Should I hear any thing material, and Mr. Sheldon have gone, I will drop you a line by post.

Accept assurances of the respect and friendship with which,

I am, dear Sir,
Your ob't. serv't.
RICHARD RUSH.

To Albert Gallatin, Esquire,
Envoy Extraordinary, and
Minister Plenipotentiary from
the United States—Paris.

July 2. Went to a party at Grosvenor House last night; the rooms filled and looking as before. Go afterwards to the Spanish ambassador's. Some cabinet ministers are there, and most of the diplomatic corps. Owing to the crowd and other hinderances, I collected no information for Mr. Gallatin. Made attempts, but was cut off from all hope of any success.

July 3. In the course of a dispatch to the Secretary of State of this date, I mention that the American steam-ship Savannah, Captain Rogers, arrived at Liverpool on the twentieth of last month, to the surprise of the people of that town, as she came up the river under the power of steam. She is a vessel of above three hundred tons' burden, as Captain Rogers, who has been to see me, states; and is the

first that has ever crossed the ocean by steam. He also stated that she worked with great ease and safety on the voyage, and used her steam full eighteen days. Her passage was twenty-six days, the weather in general having been very unfavorable; besides that she was detained five days in the Irish channel until she could get fresh coal, his own giving out when she entered the channel. He had laid in fifteen hundred bushels. Her engine is equal to a seventy-two horse power, and acts horizontally. Her wheels are on the sides, made of iron, and removable at pleasure. These particulars he mentioned, which I repeated in my dispatch.

CHAPTER IX.

VISIT TO HOLKHAM, THE ESTATE OF MR. COKE, NORFOLK COUNTY—THE SHEEP SHEARING—PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT—ENTERTAINMENT AT CARLTON HOUSE—LORD CASTLEREAGH SPEAKS OF THE FLORIDA TREATY—WHAT HE AFTERWARDS SAYS ON THAT SUBJECT, AND ON THE CASES OF ARBUTHNOT AND AMBRISTER, AT THE AUSTRIAN AMBASSADOR'S.

July 12. Yesterday I returned from a visit to Mr. Coke, of Holkham, Norfolk County. He invited me last year; but unable, from duties under an approaching negotiation, to leave town at that time, I was forced to decline, which gave me double pleasure in accepting this year. I met a large company. We had the Duke of Bedford, the Earl of Albemarle, Lord Huntingfield, Sir Henry Fane, Sir Henry Erne, Sir Jacob Astley, Sir John Sinclair, Sir William Bolton, General Fitzroy, Captain Edgell of the Navy, Mr. Wilbraham, of Cheshire, Mr. Beckford, of Suffolk, Mr. Maude, of Yorkshire,

Mr. Beaumont, of the House of Commons, Dr. Rigby, Mr. Owen, Mr. Bennett, Sir Robert Harland, the Marquis of Tavistock, Lord Barrington, the Earl of Bradford, Lord Nugent, and many others whose names I cannot recall. Of my countrymen, there were General Harper, of Maryland, General Boyd, of Boston, Mr. Oliver and Mr. Patterson, of Baltimore, Mr. Somerville, of Maryland, and Mr. Ogle Tayloe, of Virginia, the latter an attaché to my Legation.

Holkham is among the best cultivated estates in England. Of the entire system of agriculture by which Mr. Coke has so greatly improved it, as well as benefitted England by his example of good farming during more than forty years, thus increasing the public wealth as well as his own, I am not qualified to speak properly. The whole has been well described by Dr. Rigby, of Norwich, in his excellent little work entitled, "Holkham and its Agriculture;" but I may note in general terms a few of the things which struck me as an American and stranger, in my visit of a week to this celebrated estate.

The occasion on which we were assembled was called the "Sheep Shearing." It was the forty-third anniversary of this attractive festival; attractive even to Englishmen—accustomed as they are to agricultural beauty, and to fine old country home-

steads, established and maintained throughout ages, in so many different parts of England. The term "Sheep Shearing" conveys, by itself, but a limited idea of what is witnessed at Holkham. The operations embrace every thing connected with agriculture in the broadest sense; such as, an inspection of all the farms which make up the Holkham estate, with the modes of tillage practised on each, for all varieties of crops; an exhibition of cattle, with the modes of feeding and keeping them; ploughing matches; hay making; a display of agricultural implements, and modes of using them; the visiting of various out-buildings, stables, and so on, best adapted to good farming and the rearing and care of stock; with much more that I need not specify. Sheep Shearing there was, indeed; but it was only one item in this full round of practical agriculture. The whole lasted three days, occupying the morning of each, until dinner time at about 5 o'clock. The shearing of sheep, was the closing operation of the third day.

Such is the general scene as far as agriculture is concerned, which is its primary object. Mr. Coke explains to his guests and friends, all his processes and results. This is done without form, in conversation on his grounds; or at the dinner table; and, even more impressively, on horseback. Then it is that you have more of the port of the old

English country gentleman, as he jovially rides from field to field, and farm to farm, attended by his friends, who are also mounted. From these also, he invites inquiry and criticism; and, from those agricultural in their pursuits, a communication of their modes of farming, that results may be compared, and truth the better arrived at in this great science.

Of the social scene which goes hand in hand with it all, I hardly dare trust myself to speak, lest I should seem to exaggerate. The number of Mr. Coke's guests, meaning those lodged at his mansion, was, I believe, about fifty, comprehending those I have named and others—as I could scarcely know all in a visit of a week. But his friends and neighbors of the county of Norfolk, and the country gentlemen and visitors from parts of England further off, arriving every morning after breakfast, in carriages or on horseback, during the continuance of the scene, under invitations from Mr. Coke to be present at it and stay to dinner, amounted to about six hundred each day. On the second day, I was informed that, including the home guests, covers were laid down for six hundred and fifty. All were comfortably accommodated, and fared sumptuously. Holkham House covers an acre of ground. Looking at it on one of the mornings after breakfast, with the Duke of Bedford and others, and viewing its imposing

centre, from which proceed four wings connected by corridors, the general conjecture seemed to be, that such an edifice could scarcely be built at the present day for less than half a million of pounds sterling. *It was built, I understood, in the middle or early part of last century by Lord Leicester, who was many years in Italy, where he studied the models upon which, after his return to England, it was erected.

Of the furniture in such a mansion, the paintings, tapestry, rural ornaments, and all else, it need but be said, that they are adapted to the mansion itself; ancient, rich, and appropriate. The library, of many thousand volumes, is a treasure; and (shall I tell it?) there, yes, *there*, on one of the days when I entered it, during a short interval between the morning excursions and the dinner hour, did I catch stragglers, of the home guests, *country* gentlemen too, who had not been out to the *fields* or *farms* at all, although they had come all the way to Holkham to attend the Sheep Shearing! And no wonder! In fact, they were of the younger portion of the guests (*young-uns*, as Mr. Coke slyly said, in jeering them) not long from the University; so recently, that the love of practically inspecting wheat fields, even if they had yielded twice twelve combs* the acre, or of seeing turnips drilled in ridges on the

*Ninety-six bushels.

Northumberland method, or of walking upon lawns of grass where the sod was formed by *dotting*, had not yet so deadened classical ardor as to keep them from stealing off to where they could find curious editions of Pliny, and Ovid, and the Georgics; or, if they liked Italian better, lay their hands on the identical Boccacio, which Cosmo de Medici sent as a present to Alphonso, King of Naples; or turn to something else seducing or curious in literature. Mr. Coke was, I believe, himself, a Cambridge man. He has been forty years in parliament, and to this day proclaims that he voted on the side of America, during the war of our revolution throughout the whole contest; even at a time when only two or three others in the house of commons besides himself, continued to stand up for our cause.

On the first day after my arrival the company at dinner consisted of the home guests only, the agricultural scenes not beginning until the day following. Among other massive plate upon the table, was a large fabric of silver, in the form of an urn, highly ornamented. It stood conspicuously as the centre piece, and was a present to Mr. Coke by the inhabitants of Norfolk, as a mark of their gratitude for the good he had done the county by improving the condition of its agriculture, and contained appropriate emblems, and an inscription. Among the former, was a representation of the mode of cultivat-

ing by drill; a southdown sheep; a north Devon cow; and other figures illustrative of improvements in husbandry introduced, or successfully practised, by Mr. Coke. The inhabitants of the county having, at first, opposed many of the improvements, and especially on the ground that his innovations trenched upon the labor and comforts of the poor, the insrciption embraced an acknowledgment of their error in terms complimentary to him, and very honorable to them. It was a beautiful trophy, all round.

On the first of the festival days, the company in the statue gallery, a very large room, amounted probably to a couple of hundred. All were accommodated at two tables. Mr. Coke presided at one; the Duke of Bedford at the other. It was my fortune to be at the former, and next to Mr. Coke. Throughout successive rooms communicating with each other, and with the statue gallery, tables were laid for all the other guests; therefore, though none of the tables were in sight from the statue gallery, which opened to the others from doors at the end, voices could be heard from them all.

The dinner courses being finished, Mr. Coke rose to bid all his guests welcome, and express the pleasure he felt in seeing them at Holkham.

His first toast was "LIVE AND LET LIVE." This was known to be applicable to his own system,

which was to let his farms at moderate rents, under leases not too long, and not be hard with his tenants; a system which, in the long run, had benefitted equally himself and his tenants.

The toast was received with rapturous applause, amounting to shouts of joy, from room to room. As the voices pealed through all, the effect was highly animating. It was not less so when the Duke of Bedford was given as a toast, with allusions by Mr. Coke to the services of his family in the cause of English liberty. The shouts, loud and long, that followed each toast, echoing through the apartments of this stately mansion, standing by itself in the centre of a rural domain, and heard somewhat faintly in our statue gallery from the remote rooms, but still heard, until the sounds died upon the ear, had something in them to fill the fancy. The scene seemed to recall baronial days, the "moated ramparts, embattled towers, and trophied halls." It brought back the remembrance of feudal banquets, as if here seen in alliance with modern freedom and refinements. So at least I felt. Others may have had less of this feeling, or none of it; unless my own countrymen present. Perhaps more of the romance of English history, is apt to linger in the mind of an American visiting England, than in an Englishman's. To the former, the whole is an abstraction—like ancient history—until he gets to

England; then, Waterloo bridge built yesterday, and vestiges of the olden time, are equally new to his senses. Saxon days, Norman days, the Plantagenets, the Tudors, the Stuarts, seem to come over him in the midst of modern days, and engross his thoughts and feelings at every turn.

Mr. Coke gave my name as a toast, to make it the medium of friendly sentiments towards the United States, which he strongly expressed, and which were echoed from room to room in tones gratifying to me and my countrymen. In the course of his remarks, he paid a tribute to the character of Washington. I rose to make my acknowledgments; and in reference to his notice of Washington, I said, that it was indeed a name to which every American looked with as much of veneration as might be paid to a mortal, and that the manner in which it had just been alluded to, and received before so numerous and distinguished an assemblage in England, was a new proof that his fame was a part of history, and his virtues the property of mankind. I spoke of Mr. Coke as the friend of America, whom we honored as such, yet ever true to his own country whilst loving ours; and I asked permission to propose, as a toast, "Mr. Coke and the Holkham Agriculture," not merely as a high gratification to my own feelings, but from being sure also that my countrymen

would all eagerly join in it. The toast, I need scarcely add, was received with like plaudits.

The Holkham estate commands in part a view of the sea, to which some of its boundaries extend. Although the sittings at dinner each day were not short, under the abundant topics and occasional speeches (happily none of them long) which the festivities drew out, there is yet so prolonged a twilight in England at this season, that a remnant of time was on hand for walks or drives, after rising from table. On leaving it one of the evenings, Mr. Coke invited me to a seat with him in his carriage. After our active campaign on horseback all the morning, and the exciting scene at the dinner table during several hours, a quiet drive in the cool of the evening, through beautiful scenery and grounds, with such a host, was a delightful recreation with which to close such a day, and fill up the measure of its agreeable recollections. We went in the direction of the sea. Still full of the topics of the day, he could not speak but to impart information. He said that his timber, by careful planting, annually yielded almost as large a revenue as the whole of his estate, when he first came to the possession of it. It was chiefly the chestnut and black Italian poplar that he planted—sometimes other sorts, and always in quantities to replace, as each year came round, the number of acres annually deprived of timber.

Time thus kept up the supply, planting keeping even pace with cutting down; a process the more striking to an American, in whose country, timber, for the most part, is removed to get at the soil, instead of being grown as an agricultural crop, to yield its annual harvests. Something else he said, which may deserve a memorandum. It was, that although banking along the sea side was considered the hardest work done in Norfolk county by laboring men, those who followed it drank nothing but water; they had plenty of animal food, but found their strength fail them if they drank either beer or spirits.

As the chariot rolled on, we forgot agriculture in other and easy talk. He told anecdotes. We had been out an hour. Presently we approached the little town of Wells, near the sea—a fishing town. The wind freshened, and we drew up the glasses as night came on. He asked, if I knew any thing of ********. I replied that I did, by rumor; it was a South Carolina story—a sad one. There, he said, in that little town, the person lives, unknown to all. We staid a few minutes in the town, and could hear, as darkness was closing around us, the surging of the waters on the shore. Seated again in the chariot, our familiar conversation was resumed. We were soon in view of Holkham House once more, the twinkling lights showing that its festivities were

not yet all at an end. When we got in, it was past ten. The general dinner company had dispersed; but of the home guests, a number still remained in the drawing rooms—some conversing in little knots, others seated at whist tables. By eleven, most of them had dropped off to their bed rooms. The few left, had a summons to supper in the statue gallery. Our table, to be sure, was of dimensions different from those at dinner; but we were headed by our host. Lord Nugent was of the small group, and well able to help keep the ball of conversation in motion at a late hour. It was in courtesy to me, that he made Commodore Perry of our navy, one of his topics. He said, that when travelling in Italy, he had met him, and, on his invitation, took a little trip with him from one of the Mediterranean ports, in his frigate—then the Java. He was struck with his chivalrous character; and, for his seamanship, mentioned this incident: that whilst attempting to beat his frigate through the straits of Gibraltar, a British frigate was close in view. Some of the officers in the latter, not thinking it could be done, as the wind set, made bets upon the issue. The Java did it handsomely, which drew loud hurras from the winners on the English deck. Midnight passed before we went to bed.

The foregoing comprise some of the recollections of my visit. They give but an inadequate descrip-

tion of the interest and beauty of the whole scene. Of the manner in which Mr. Coke dispensed the hospitalities of the week, it would be impossible to say too much. All received from him the greatest attention and kindness. His landed property in Norfolk, comprehends, I understood, more than thirty thousand acres, and he has estates in other parts of England. His income from the whole, is rated, I believe, at sixty thousand pounds sterling a year, going higher, when agricultural prices are high. On one of the days, we were shown through all the offices of the basement story of the house, and taken into the cellars. The latter were filled with the abundant and various stores and wines to have been expected at a country homestead in England, long the seat of that species of hospitality where it would be hard to decide whether the eye is most struck with what is munificent, or the heart with what is kind. I had reason to know, that at Christmas, and other seasons devoted to country festivities in England, although Holkham House was not indeed filled as I lately saw it, its hospitalities were bravely kept up. Mr. Blakie, the steward of Mr. Coke, informed us that the annual cost of malt liquors used for the entire Holkham establishment, including the working people out of doors, as well as servants of the household, was three thousand pounds. This included the taxes upon it. The

enclosure round the park, is ten miles in extent. The arrangement and beauty of the gardens, and extent and productiveness of the kitchen garden, may be conceived better than I could describe them.

As to field sports, fox hounds are no longer kept, Mr. Coke having given them up in the early part of his life. But as for game, that pursuit goes on, *con amore*, as may be inferred when I venture to repeat what he told me; viz. that a few years ago, himself and friends had shot upon his grounds during the shooting season, twelve thousand rabbits and three thousand hares, with the full proportion of pheasants and partridges.

Here I must end my little record of the Holkham Sheep Shearing. It has been faithfully but imperfectly made from notes taken on my return from it. Excellent as the Holkham agriculture was reputed to be in its day, what have not been the intermediate improvements? "SCIENCE WITH PRACTICE," to take the appropriate motto of the Agricultural Society now established and in operation for all England, instead of letting agriculture depend only on the local societies as formerly, seems to have been working almost the same proportional results for the productiveness of the soil of late years in that country, which steam has been effecting in commerce and the mechanic arts, there, and every where. Her example in agriculture is worth atten-

tion. The improvements going on within her borders in that great pursuit, seem to give promise that Britain's home dominions may sustain a population of eighty or a hundred millions a century hence, more easily than thirty millions now; so vast are the results which modern science and practice are effecting, by *thorough drainage* and other means, in the power of producing food for the sustenance of man. It was only in the autumn of 1843, that Sir Robert Peel in his speech at the "Tamworth Farmer's Club," is reported to have stated, from experiments on his own estates, that a modern species of manure called "*Potter's Composition*" had made his ground more productive in the proportion of one-sixth, than when stable manure was used; and that *guano*, introduced still more recently, rendered it productive in the further proportion of one-fourth more than was effected by "Potter's Composition." He is reported to have said, in the same speech, that "if any of the tenants on his estates felt themselves injured by rabbits or hares, eager sportsman as he was, he would be ready to consent to their destruction." When the prime minister of England, with all his other labors and solicitudes, is seen thus zealously to lend himself to practical improvements in agriculture, it may be taken as one strong omen, in connexion with the many others, that great and substantial improvements are at hand.

But no matter what may be in the future, Mr. Coke will ever take honorable rank among the pioneers in the great work. Come what will, the "Holkham Sheep Shearing" will long live in English rural annals. Long will tradition speak of them as uniting improvements in agriculture, to an abundant cordial and joyous hospitality.*

July 13. A note from the master of ceremonies having informed me that the prorogation of Parliament takes place by the Prince Regent in person to day at two o'clock, I go to the House of Lords to witness it. Forms were much the same as last year, when Parliament was dissolved. Novelty therefore did not attract me, and I will not repeat the description; but being notified of the ceremonial by an officer of the royal household, I attended, as did the other foreign ambassadors and ministers. A similar notice is given to them at the opening of Parliament, whenever the Sovereign opens it in person.

July 16. Went with my wife to a "Fancy Ball," at Carlton House last night. The company consisted of probably more than a thousand. A

* Mr. Coke died as Earl of Leicester about two years ago; and late accounts state, that a column one hundred and twenty feet in height, with the proper emblematical devices, is to be reared in Norfolk county to his agricultural renown.

fancy ball means, that dresses are to be worn, not solely in the fashion of the present day in England, but *at the fancy* of the wearer; and accordingly, the fashions of past ages and different nations, are adopted. The effect is highly picturesque. A feudal baron of king John's time; a crusader of the train of Richard Cœur de Lion; a French Knight of the 13th century, the Black Prince himself, and a modern Tyrolese rifleman, may all be seen in the same group. As to the ladies, one may be dressed like a shepherdess of the Alps; another to personate the maid of Orleans; a third, move in state under a full court dress of the days of Queen Elizabeth; a fourth be in character as the lady Phillipa of Hainault; a fifth as a flower girl, and so on, throughout an endless variety of characters. I am not meaning to say, exactly how the company were dressed last night, but only to give a general idea of the fancy ball! If any of the characters last night, violated the proprieties of the age into which they stepped, educated eyes would detect them; which obliged the groups of patrician dramatis personæ, to revive their antiquarian learning in the field of costume. It may be inferred, that no cost was spared to meet the requisitions of this emulous scene at the domicil of an English Sovereign; and that among the many voluntary participants in it, resources of art and taste, were sometimes drawn upon in ways to attract

favorable notice. The foreign ambassadors and ministers, members of the cabinet, and other official persons, were dressed as usual. These or portions of them, appeared to be occupied in beholding the pageant; or, it may be, that some were freshening their historical recollections under these outward characteristics of some six hundred years, personified before their eyes in the Royal apartments. Mr. Canning, with whom I talked, appeared to enjoy it all, with quite a zest; as did probably other grave members of both Houses of Parliament, who were present in the usual dress for evening entertainments in the court circles. And why not enjoy it? The Speaker of the House of Commons in his address to the Prince Regent when the prorogation took place, had, only a day or two before, declared it to have been one of the longest and most arduous sessions known to the records of England; and is not recreation due after such labors?

Public men however think of public affairs at all times, and last night was no exception. More than one member of the diplomatic corps asked me in whispers, if I felt sure that England had no hand in stopping the ratification of the Florida treaty? I replied, that I was unwilling to believe it. One of them said, that the rumors were strong to that effect.

But why should the matter remain in doubt, when

it might be made certain? Lord Castlereagh was present. See him where you would, he had always an ear for public affairs. I sought him in the glittering throng. But to be able to speak to a minister of state at such a time in the way you desire, is not always easy. Others seek him as well as yourself. There is always something to be said to the foreign secretary of a great nation, when the representatives of other nations and his own official colleagues, surround him, even though it be at a "Fancy Ball." Some go to such scenes, with perhaps no other object than to put a question to him, better so asked, than under circumstances more formal. Hence, you have to watch your chance. Mine came, at last, when the entertainment was well nigh over. Then, after an introductory remark, I said to his Lordship, how much the interest of the evening would be increased to me, if he would put it in my power to say to my government, that it was through no wish of His Majesty's government delays occurred in the ratification of our treaty, that thus my own belief might be confirmed.

He replied, that the difficulties, of whatever nature they might be, rested with Spain entirely, for that England was doing nothing to delay the ratification; and of this, I might feel assured.

It was very satisfactory to me to come away with such an assurance from Lord Castlereagh. The

pleasure of mingling in a scene otherwise attractive, would have been marred by the least intimation to the contrary.

July 19. Went to Prince Esterhazy's last night, the entertainment being in honor of the birthday of his Sovereign. The Prince Regent was there, and in compliment to the occasion, wore the uniform of an Austrian Field Marshal, the Duke of Wellington doing the same. There were present also, the Duke and Dutchess of York, the Duke and Dutchess of Kent, the Duke and Dutchess of Gloucester; the Princess Augusta, Prince Leopold,* the foreign ambassadors and ministers and their ladies, and Lord and Lady Castlereagh, with several of the cabinet ministers and their ladies; the company not being numerous but of much distinction.

I had a conversation with Lord Castlereagh, more than commonly interesting; for a notice of which, other incidents of the entertainment will be passed over.

I improved a convenient moment for approaching him, to express the pleasure I had derived from what he said at Carlton House a few evenings before, about the Florida treaty.

He now remarked, with all friendliness of manner, that His Majesty's government neither had done,

* Afterwards king of Belgium.

nor would do, any thing whatever to prevent or retard, its ratification.

I here renewed the expression of my satisfaction; telling him also, that I had already reported to my government the assurance, transient and informal as it was, which he had given me at Carlton House.

He then recurred, of his own accord, to the affair of Arbuthnot and Ambrister. He remarked, that it had been a case of no common difficulty; the cabinet had found it so, and he hoped that the proper inferences would be drawn by the government of of the United States, respecting the conciliatory dispositions of England on that occasion.

I replied, that I believed my government would not fail to draw the proper inferences, and certainly I had not failed in making communications to it calculated to lead to them; for that here, on the spot, I had seen and fully appreciated the difficulties which encompassed His Majesty's ministers; whose wisdom and firmness, throughout that whole transaction, if I might presume to say so, I considered a blessing to both countries. He then added these words: That had the English cabinet felt and acted otherwise than it did, such was the temper of parliament and such the feeling of the country, he believed WAR MIGHT HAVE BEEN PRODUCED BY HOLDING UP A FINGER; and he even thought an address to the

crown might have been carried for one, BY NEARLY AN UNANIMOUS VOTE.

These words made their impression upon me. I thought them memorable at the time. I think so still. They were calmly but deliberately spoken. Lord Castlereagh was not a man to speak hastily. Always self-possessed, always firm and fearless, his judgment was the guide of his opinions, and his opinions of his conduct, undaunted by opposition, in Parliament or out of it. Political foes conceded to him these qualities. What he said to me on this occasion I have reasons for knowing he said to others, in effect, if not in words; and I wrote his words to my government. The lapse of a quarter of a century ought not to diminish the feeling properly due to a British ministry which, by its single will, resisting the nearly universal feeling of the two great parties of the kingdom, in all probability prevented a war; a war into which passion might have rushed, but for the preponderating calmness and reason in those who wielded at that epoch the executive power of England.

CHAPTER X.

ORDER IN COUNCIL PROHIBITING THE EXPORTATION OF ARMS TO SPAIN. PARTY AT PRINCE LEOPOLD'S. LETTERS TO MR. GALLATIN, AND COLONEL TRUMBULL. DINNER AT THE VICE CHANCELLOR'S. NOTICE OF CERTAIN MEASURES OF PARLIAMENT, AMONGST THEM, MR. PEEL'S REPORT ON THE CURRENCY.

July 20. By an order in council passed last week, the exportation of gunpowder, saltpetre, or of arms and amunition of any description from the ports of Great Britain, to any ports within the dominion of the king of Spain, is prohibited. This interdict comes opportunely after the Foreign Enlistment bill. It takes the ground as far as it goes, of neutrality in substance as well as name between Spain and the colonies; there having been an order in force for some time prohibiting the exportation of the same things to Spanish America.

July 23. Last night we were at Prince Leopold's, Marlborough House. The Prince Regent and

most of the Royal Family, were there; a great assemblage of nobility; the foreign ambassadors and ministers, with many others of the court circle.

This Prince, consort of the late heiress presumptive to the throne, long in retirement after her death, now returns to society, and Marlborough House, built for the great Duke of Marlborough, becomes his residence and scene of his hospitalities. Being there, for the first time, last night, I could not divest myself of the historical associations which belong to the house. The spacious hall is ornamented with paintings illustrative of the Duke's victories. Among them is the great battle of Hochstadt, (or Blenheim) where the French commander, Tallard, was taken; and where he, the Duke, and Prince Eugene, are all represented. In the principal drawing room, hangs a full-length portrait of the late Princess Charlotte, by Sir Thomas Lawrence.

One anecdote connected with this edifice, bearing the historical name of "Marlborough House," is, that, when first erected, it so overshadowed St. James's Palace, which it adjoins, as to excite the jealousy of Queen Anne. Others are told, pointing to the supposed avarice of the Duke whilst it was building, which need not be repeated; the less, as in a conversation I had the honor to hold with a distinguished lady at this party, we spoke of Coxe's life of Marlborough, lately published, where the Duke's

private correspondence, given with all apparent fidelity, does not, as we both agreed, seem to show any traces of the disposition to avarice so long and generally imputed to him. The same lady spoke of Evelyn's Memoirs, a recent attractive publication, which she had also been reading, and which she commended highly.

July 24. Yesterday, Mr. Bourke, the Danish minister, and Mrs. Bourke; Count Ludolf, Neapolitan minister, and Countess Ludolf; Baron Langsdorff, minister from Baden and Hesse; Baron Bulow, Prussian Chargé d'Affaires; General Cadwalader, Mr. David Parish, and Dr. Bollman, the three last of the United States, dine with us. Count Ludolf tells me that Sir Henry Wellesley, British Ambassador at Madrid, writes word to his government that the Florida treaty will be ratified. He also mentions a report that the Chevalier de Onis has been forbidden to enter Madrid; and informs me that affairs between Spain and Portugal remain unsettled, the former still refusing an adjustment of the difficulty about Montevideo, upon the basis proposed by the Allied Powers at Aix la Chapelle.

July 25. Write the following letter to Mr. Gallatin, which belongs to the topics of that of the 30th of June:

LONDON, *July* 25, 1819.

Dear Sir,—Your letter of the 9th instant was delivered to me by Mr. Gibbs, and I am under obligations to you for the views which it presents of our affairs. It was a relief to me, in the present state of them, to be favored with your opinions.

I have to thank you also for the copy of Mr. Forsyth's letter,* which you were so good as to enclose. I pray you to excuse my now troubling you with one for him, which I venture to do from supposing that you may be able to command better means of forwarding it to Madrid than I possess.

Although your letter seems to take for granted that * * * * * * * is here, I have not yet been able to ascertain the fact. The newspaper notice of his arrival, I have reason to know, rested on conjecture only. Nevertheless, he may be here; and if it be a part of his purpose to keep out of view, I need not say to you how many chances of success London will afford him.

But perhaps it will be deemed more important when I inform you, that I have had two interesting conversations with Lord Castlereagh himself, on the subject of our treaty with Spain; and I am happy to add, that he assures me this government has taken no steps whatever to prevent its ratification, and does not mean to give us any trouble on this

* Mr. Forsyth succeeded Mr. Ewing as United States Minister to Spain.

head. Such assurances have not been limited to me alone. I have reason to believe that he has uttered similar sentiments in some of the circles of the diplomatic corps. The enclosed letter to Mr. Forsyth conveys to him, the information of these assurances.

I have waited for a private opportunity to send this letter, and will be sure to afford you any further information I may acquire, which I think may be acceptable you.

I am, Dear Sir,
in great Respect and Friendship,
your Obedient Servant,
RICHARD RUSH.

ALBERT GALLATIN, Esquire,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary
from the United States—Paris.

July 28. I give place to a letter below, addressed to Colonel Trumbull, President of the Academy of Fine Arts in New York, relating to a full length portrait of Mr. West, President of the Royal Academy in London, by Sir Thomas Lawrence; towards the painting of which the New York Academy had asked my superintendence. This I was happy to give, glad that so rising an Institution in our country dedicated to the Fine Arts, should have been ambitious of obtaining the likeness of Mr.

West, whom America claims as a native son. The letter may serve in some degree to show the nature and extent of the employments of the first portrait painter in England at that day.

LONDON, *July* 28, 1819.

Dear Sir,—It is with great concern I have to state, that the portrait of Mr. West still remains unfinished. Sir Thomas Lawrence left London for Aix la Chapelle, shortly after my communication to you in August last, with a view, I believe, to take the likenesses of some of the sovereigns of Europe, expected to assemble there. He proceeded thence to other parts of the continent, and to this day has not got back to England. It is painful to me to inform you that Mr. West again lies ill, and that there are but feeble hopes of his permanent recovery. I understand Sir Thomas says, that the picture is sufficiently advanced in its essential points to be completed with every advantage, in the event of Mr. West's death; but on this subject I cannot at present speak with confidence, and as little can I make inquiry of the venerable President himself. I cannot affirm, with accuracy, how many pictures were left by Sir Thomas in an unfinished state when he went away; but in such universal demand is his pencil in the leading classes throughout England, that I remember it was a current saying, that he had begun more than a life of a hundred years would

enable him to complete. There seem peculiarly strong reasons why the Academy at New York ought not to be among the disappointed, and I will cherish the hope that this is not to be the case.

As soon after Sir Thomas's return as I may find it practicable to obtain an interview with him, I will again write to you; and, in the meantime, have the honor to be,

With great respect,
your obedient servant,
RICHARD RUSH.

To I. TRUMBULL, Esquire,
President of the Academy of Fine Arts,
New York.

I add, that the picture was, in the end, finished, and safely received by the Academy in New York.

July 29. Dine with the Vice Chancellor, Sir John Leech. His Royal Highness, the Duke of Gloucester, General Mathews, Sir Archibald Murray, the Marchioness of Downshire, Lady Clare, Mr. and Mrs. Stanhope, and others, were of the company.

The Duke of Gloucester had been on a visit to Holkham since the sheep-shearing, and he spoke of it. He agreed to the description given of it by Sir Benjamin Hobhouse, namely, that all "Mr. Coke's farms seemed like horticulture upon a great scale;"

and added that the Holkham estate could hardly be better described in a few words.

The Vice Chancellor is among the many instances illustrating the democratical part of the British constitution, as does the present Lord Chancellor; both these high functionaries, the latter uniting the highest honors of the state with those of the law, having risen to their posts without any aids from family or fortune, relying upon nothing but their talents, industry, integrity, and unshaken perseverance.

July 30. Under this date, I write a dispatch to the Secretary of State, with some account of the measures of the session of Parliament lately ended, limiting it to those which bear upon the interests of the United States, and to a few of the subjects of primary importance, affecting the home interests of this kingdom.

Under the former head I mention, 1st, the act for carrying into more full effect the convention which Mr. Gallatin and I negotiated with this government last October, the eighth section of which provides that no higher duties are henceforth to be laid, under any pretext whatever, on American vessels entering British ports, than are payable on British vessels; the act thus redeeming the promises made to me by Mr. Robinson, under my remonstrances to the British government on this subject.

2dly, I mention the resolution which passed each House of Parliament, to present an address to the Prince Regent, requesting that His Majesty's ministers would renew their efforts with foreign powers, and particularly with France and the United States, for rendering the laws passed against the slave trade more effectual; stating that it was on the Marquis of Lansdowne's motion that the resolution passed the House of Lords in this form, and on the motion of Mr. Wilberforce that it passed the House of Commons.

As regards the principal home measures, I mention, 1st, THE LEVYING OF NEW TAXES. The whole expenses of the year up to April, being in round numbers, sixty-seven millions of pounds, (including fifteen millions applied towards reducing the national debt,) and the income fifty-four millions, I state that a loan of twelve millions, was, in this condition of the finances, negotiated during the year; and new taxes imposed in the shape of excise on consumable articles, and new custom-house duties, in expectation that the whole would add three millions to the revenue.

2. I speak of THE POOR LAWS, and sums raised under them, being an aggregate of about eight millions sterling for the year; saying that it seems agreed on all hands to be the heaviest pecuniary burden as a single one, which England has to bear;

and that how to get rid of, or mitigate it, seems to perplex her wisest men. And I state, that, in the midst of conflicting and anxious opinions, taken up independent of party, the plan of Mr. Robert Owen has been deemed of sufficient interest, from its novelty, to become a subject of investigation and debate in the House of Commons. I briefly describe the plan as one for gathering together all the destitute of the manufacturing and laboring classes into regular villages or districts of country, in the proportion of one person to every acre of land, with some established police or authority for enforcing within these villages, a proper routine of agricultural, horticultural, and manufacturing labor; in which general plan, the projector supposes a cure is to be found for the present evils of pauperism. I add in my dispatch, that whatever may be the benevolent intentions of Mr. Owen, or the ingenuity of some of his suggestions, and however successful the plan may have been upon his own estate in Scotland, where it is stated to have succeeded, I find that those who have examined it with most care, and whose judgments are entitled to deference, are of opinion that it never can be extended to the nation at large.

3. I speak OF THE NAVY; simply mentioning, on this occasion, in addition to accounts which I have transmitted to President Monroe and to different branches of our government of the improvements

steadily going on in this grand arm of England's strength, that six millions four hundred thousand pounds was the sum appropriated for its service this year; and that the number of vessels in actual commission was one hundred and thirty-seven, twenty-four being of the line, and forty-five, frigates. For THE ARMY, I mention, that the appropriation for the year, was eight millions nine hundred thousand pounds; its whole force, at home and abroad, being computed at one hundred and four thousand men.

4. I speak OF THE CURRENCY; and the shape which this subject has assumed under the full and able report which Mr. Peel, as head of a committee in the House of Commons, made upon it. I state, that the paper system, which, amidst the shocks and trials of war during twenty years, had alternately upheld England by its benefits and afflicted her with its evils, had been finally condemned by Parliament; and that, with a view to the resumption of cash payments, both Houses came to a resolution, that on the first of February 1820, the bank should be under an obligation to deliver gold in bars of not less than sixty ounces for a proportionate amount of its notes, at four pounds one shilling an ounce; that on the first of October of the same year, it must make similar payments at the rate of £3. 19. 6, an ounce; and on the first of May, 1821, make them at the mint price of £3. 17.

10, an ounce; the last part of the system to continue in operation not less than two, nor more than three years, when the bank, in place of bullion or bars for its paper, is to pay specie. I mention that various and very discordant opinions were expressed in the progress of the discussion as to the quantity of gold which the country would require to sustain the resumption of cash payments, some estimating it as high as forty-five millions, and some as low as twenty millions; and lastly I mention that the resolution for resumption was carried through both Houses of Parliament, almost unanimously, in the face of opposition from the bank of England, and the great body of London merchants and bankers.

5. I allude to the CRIMINAL LAW; saying that its sanguinary character scarcely found an apologist in all the discussions respecting it; and I speak of the enlightened labors of Sir James Macintosh to lessen its severity, stating, that the Report which he made upon the subject, concludes with recommending the abolition of a list of capital felonies amounting in number to between thirty and forty; which report was not, however, acted upon.

6. I mention that THE CATHOLICS preferred their annual claims to be relieved from the disabilities under which they have so long labored, and that the discussions had been conducted with their usual scope and animation; that in the House of Lords,

their cause was lost by a majority of 41; but that in the House of Commons, it came extremely near to success, the majority being but *two* against it. I add, that this near approach to success in the popular branch of the Legislature, had filled this class of British subjects with new hope, and might be expected to impart to their future efforts, new activity. In regard to the number of Catholics, I mention, that, in England alone, whilst they were computed to have amounted to not more than seventy thousand when the present king ascended the throne, they were now supposed to be half a million in number; and that at Stoneyhurst, in Lancashire, where a college of Jesuits was established, the pupils, including those at a preparatory school adjoining, amounted to five hundred.

7. I notice THE CORN LAWS; this subject of parliamentary inquiry and debate, grown stale by frequency, yet ever fresh in existing interest; an interest which extends beyond England, to countries having commercial intercourse with her. I mention that these laws were left, for the present session, upon the old footing of allowing importations of wheat from foreign countries, as long as the price of native wheat in England was above eighty shillings the quarter. Under this regulation, the ports of England having remained open to bread stuffs from abroad during 1818, I also mention that, by official

returns to the House of Commons, it was found that the total value of all the wheat and other grain, including flour, imported into the kingdom during that year from the colonial possessions of Great Britain and from foreign countries, rose as high as thirteen millions of pounds sterling; a sum which appeared to have struck every body by its large amount. I added, that I had no means of ascertaining accurately what portion of this foreign wheat and flour came from the United States.

8. Education. I notice the report to the House of Commons, by which it appeared how this great work is advancing in England; for that, whilst in 1812, the number of schools, under the national school system, was only fifty-two, and the pupils eight thousand, this report shows that the former had risen, in 1818, to above fourteen hundred, and the number of pupils to two hundred thousand.

9. The Duke of York. I mention the parliamentary grant of ten thousand pounds sterling a year to the Duke of York as *custos* of the person of the king, under his continued state of mental incapacity; and I speak of the opposition which it encountered, it being asked why should a son, already receiving an income of more than thirty thousand pounds from the nation, be thus additionally paid from its purse for performing a natural duty to a

parent? and the measure having been otherwise strongly denounced.

10. Lord Camden. Acts of individual virtue and disinterestedness, being no less worthy to be told than those of an opposite complexion, I mention, that the Marquis Camden, (a title dear to America,) weighing the distresses of portions of his countrymen, came forward with a truly noble contribution to their relief. I state that he did this by the voluntary surrender to the public of a salary of nine thousand pounds sterling a year, to which he was entitled by legal and hereditary claim as one of the tellers of the exchequer, and of which he had long been in the enjoyment. I add, that the House of Commons marked this example of generosity in an individual in full life and moving in its highest and most expensive walks, by a vote of approbation which places it for ever upon their journals. Mr. Tierney pronounced it a "magnificent donation to the country," and paid other tributes to the noble donor.

The foregoing is a summary of the dispatch; and after presenting under each general head, the statements and remarks belonging to it, I briefly subjoined other matter of a public nature, of which the following is an outline.

I mentioned that the Parliament being a new one, to ascertain the relative strength of parties in the House of Commons, seemed desirable to both sides;

to which end, a trial was made on the motion of Mr. Tierney, (the recognized leader of the whigs,) on the state of the nation; that this led to a debate of the usual scope under such a motion, the avowed object being to obtain a vote of condemnation on the whole course of policy pursued by ministers, whether regarding home affairs or the foreign relations; and that on an unusually full attendance of the members, the ministers triumphed, the vote in their favor being 357, and against them, but 178.

Regarding the affairs of Europe generally, as existing in connexion with those of Britain, or bearing at all upon American interests, I stated, that the debate, although taking wide scope, brought little to light that was important, or that I had not already noticed in former communications to the department; but I gave a passage from Mr. Tierney's description of the Holy Alliance. This animated speaker said, "at first it consisted of but *four* powers; that these four had considered it their duty to impose upon France the yoke of maintaining foreign armies upon her territory, to preserve order within it, and keep the reigning family upon the throne; but that France having conducted herself to the satisfaction of her four masters, they had, at Aix la Chapelle, last autumn, determined not only to remove the yoke, but take her into partnership,

and that she now constituted a fifth member of the firm."

Giving this extract from Mr. Tierney's speech, assailing the ministry, I deemed it right to hold up, on the other hand, (passing over Lord Castlereagh's reply to the speech in the House of Commons,) the declarations made by Lord Liverpool, the Premier, in the House of Lords on the 21st of January, in reference to the Holy Alliance; with which declarations my dispatch to the Secretary of State concluded. They were, "that he, (Lord Liverpool,) felt bound in conscience to affirm, that, so far as he knew, there never was a time in the history of the world, when so general an anxiety prevailed to preserve peace; when the causes of disturbance were so completely removed; when nations and sovereigns were more divested of ambition and the love of undue influence; and when the spirit of conciliation, and the necessity for repose, were more thoroughly acknowledged, and acted upon over the whole European community."

Throughout my mission, I wrote the Secretary of State an annual dispatch after Parliament rose, on the model of the foregoing, more or less full according to circumstances; in addition to noticing, from time to time, in weekly dispatches, such of the proceedings of either House, or speeches of individual or

official members, as seemed appropriate to public obligations devolving upon me.

August 6. Go to Deptford, Greenwich and Blackheath; my main object being to visit the naval arsenal at Deptford, in the vicinity; as I did, fully.

August 9. Go to the counting house of Barings, Brothers and Company, Bishopsgate street, to draw money. I am shown their orderly arrangements for business, the daily routine of which is under the direction of Mr. Holland; an accomplished merchant, agreed by all to merit the confidence he enjoys from the great firm with which he is associated.

August 19. Go to St. Paul's, the present season allowing some few intervals for "sight-seeing." One of the foreign ministers told me soon after my arrival, that he had been eight years in London, without seeing the inside of Westminster Abbey, declaring that he had never been able to command the time for it, other engagements always stepping in with prior claims—if not of business, of ceremony, which he was not at liberty to forego.

August 20. Devote the day to visiting the London, West India, and East India Docks. The Secretary of Legation was with me. Instead of going by land,

we took a boat near Westminster bridge, for the sake of going down the Thames. We passed under the other bridges that cross the route, viz. Waterloo, Black-friars, and Southwark bridges; got out at London bridge, which you cannot safely shoot with a flowing tide, and took a fresh boat on the other side. This brought under our view, all the shipping, boats, and craft of every description, moving about the river, or stationary on its surface; and the whole river population and scene. It was an immense panorama. We had the Tower before us—that remnant of a feudal age, going back a thousand years, but now shorn of importance amidst the vast appearances of a commercial age. Below London bridge, there was, for miles, a black forest of masts and spars. Most of the ships were at anchor, in solid tiers, in the stream, with lighters at hand to put in and take out cargoes; and thousands seemed to be at that work. What struck me most, was the coal ships. There was no counting them. In some parts they seemed to choke up the river; and, although only coasters, were stout, heavy, black looking vessels—square-rigged—most of them large. These vessels, of themselves, bespoke the preponderance of the home trade of London over the foreign trade, great as were signs of the latter. Ships loaded with timber, seemed to come next in number. There was a Thames police ship, where the river magistrates

performed their duty. There was the hulk of another ship, fitted up as a church for seamen. We passed docks for building, and dry-docks for repairing merchant vessels. One of the latter was of odd construction. It was the hulk of an old Dutch ship of the line, half sunk near the shore on the Surry side, and in that manner converted into a dry-dock, in which a vessel was undergoing repairs. Sometimes you passed the decayed remains of old men of war, which seemed to tell you of battles and storms in other ages. Some were in decay, though not old. This was the case with a large frigate built of fir, in 1813, to match, so it was said, the American frigates. Getting lower down the stream, straggling ships of war were seen lying in ordinary; one had a plank stripped off from stem to stern near the water's edge, to let in air to prevent rot. But I never should finish if I glanced at only a tithe of the multitude of things to strike the eye of a stranger. The scene occupied me more than the docks, which I had set out expressly to visit. The docks, indeed with all that they contain, present imposing images of commercial power; but to pass in review that portion of London on the north bank of the Thames from Westminster bridge to the docks, with its piles of buildings, its spires, its domes, its monuments, its manufacturing establishments, and other works and edifices; taking in also the solid bridges, packed with

human crowds incessantly moving, with the immensity of shipping after you reach London bridge, and all else arresting attention on the river and on both shores,—is to behold tokens of every other kind of power. You behold industry and art under a thousand forms; you behold the accumulated capital of ages, all in activity; all teeming with present results. You behold, in every direction, signs of national energy, enterprise and opulence; much of it, as if just bursting out. Such to me, was the real scene of yesterday, keeping this side of all exaggeration. It was said by one of the Popes a century ago, that if the treasury of Augustus had been put up to sale, London could have bought it—a strong figure of speech; but what are not its riches now, increasing as they have been ever since, under new sources of trade and industry; and more of late years than ever? New buildings, new bridges, and other new improvements in all ways, attest the extent of its modern, and daily increasing prosperity and wealth.

I need not go into detail about the docks. Like the river, they were filled with vessels, except the East India docks. These had comparatively few; but they were large, and, at a distance, looked like frigates. The London docks can receive, it is said, five hundred merchantmen; as many, if not a greater number, are accommodated in the export and import West India docks.

I close this brief notice of the scene on the Thames, by mentioning, that a London merchant, likely to be well informed, with whom I was afterwards talking about it, said, that upwards of eight millions sterling had been expended, since 1800, on docks, bridges, custom-house buildings, walls, and other establishments connected with the port and commerce of this great city.

It may be added, that since the epoch to which the foregoing notice refers, St. Katherine's dock, the largest of all the commercial docks, has been constructed at an expense of two millions of pounds sterling; and that the Thames tunnel has also been constructed, which, in some respects, may be considered as the greatest of all the public works connected with the river. It was the man whom Sir James Mackintosh, in the House of Commons, pronounced "the soldier, the sailor, the historian, the poet, and the statesman;" it was that man, Sir Walter Raleigh, who said, that "whosoever commands the sea, commands the trade of the world; whosoever commands the trade of the world, commands the riches of the world, and consequently the world itself." England does not forget this; and whoever will descend the Thames, even from London bridge to the commercial docks, and keep looking all around, and, when at the latter, see also the immense ware-housing system in full and suc-

cessful operation, with the many other facilities and sources of a vast commerce from this great metropolitan city of England, without considering her other ports, may mark how steadily she moves forward on the road, which Sir Walter Raleigh so epigrammatically pointed out two centuries ago. And it is remarkable, that her advance in commercial power goes on at an even pace with predictions from the writers of other countries and her own, that her ruin or decay is fast approaching. The predictions began at least as long ago as Queen Anne's time, with her own Davenant, who made them in very confident terms.

CHAPTER XI.

ENTERTAINMENT AT THE FRENCH AMBASSADOR'S—THE FLORIDA TREATY. BREWERY OF TRUEMAN, HANBURY AND COMPANY. DINNER AT LORD CASTLEREAGH'S, NORTH CRAY—AMERICAN FLYING SQUIRRELS AND HUMMING BIRDS—ANECDOTE OF THE PERSIAN AMBASSADOR. INTERVIEW WITH LORD CASTLEREAGH ON THE WEST INDIA TRADE AND OTHER SUBJECTS. MR. STRATFORD CANNING APPOINTED MINISTER TO THE UNITED STATES. DINNER AT MR. LYTTLETON'S.

August 26. Last evening the French ambassador celebrated the birth day of his sovereign by an entertainment. The Duke and Dutchess of Kent, Lord Castlereagh and other cabinet ministers, the diplomatic corps, and other company were present.

Again I had opportunities of informally conversing with Lord Castlereagh. Salutations over, I began conversation with him by alluding to the strong rumors I had heard in the diplomatic circle, of Mr. Bagot being about to succeed Lord Cathcart as

ambassador at St. Petersburgh. I then asked, if he would put it in my power to announce to my government, who was likely to take Mr. Bagot's place at Washington?

His lordship replied, that Mr. Bagot's appointment to Russia, although not yet publicly made known, was, he believed, a measure determined upon by the Prince Regent. He had the more pleasure in saying so to me, because he felt that it would be taken as a new proof of the importance attached to the American mission, when faithful services in it became the passport to an ambassador's post at so leading a court in Europe; that as to Mr. Bagot's successor in the British mission at Washington, one had not yet been named; they felt an anxious desire that the choice should fall upon a person endowed with every suitable qualification, and as soon as it was made, he would inform me of it.

This topic ended, "No ratification of our treaty, yet, my lord?" was my next remark. "So it appears," was his reply; "but I hope you are well convinced, that the ratification does not linger through our means?"

I answered, "certainly, after what your lordship said to me at Carlton House, and Prince Esterhazy's, I feel entirely convinced that it does not; and I have had great pleasure in communicating to the President what fell from you on both occasions."

"I will say more," he continued. "As far as we have given expression to any opinion or wish to Spain, it has been the other way; *it has been that the treaty may be ratified.*"

"This then, I rejoined, "is a communication which I shall make to my government with increased satisfaction."

"Let me deal candidly," he proceeded. "It can little be supposed, were it an open question, that we would not prefer that Spain should own the Floridas, to their falling into your hands. She is weak; you are strong; but the treaty has been made, and we prefer its ratification to the possibility of any serious disturbance to the pacific relations between the United States and Spain. These we are sincerely desirous to see maintained, from the propitious influence it will continue to shed upon the general repose of the world." I said I was sure my government would hear with great satisfaction the expression of such sentiments.

Pursuing the subject he remarked, that whenever it appeared to this government that the United States were really manifesting a spirit of encroachment at which other nations might justifiably take exception, it might perhaps feel itself called upon to utter other opinions; but he did not think the present case open to such views. I again rejoined how happy I was to hear him express himself in this

manner in relation to the Florida treaty, and agreed that principles of moderation were those by which it would be best for all nations to steer.

The United States manifesting a spirit of encroachment! England to think this! England whose empire encircles the globe! But it was not for me to reason with the sentiment as it then fell from Lord Castlereagh. It was neither the occasion nor place. Had England intervened, to frustrate or retard the ratification of our treaty, the United States would have had ground of complaint; but as she was doing the reverse, the moment would have been ill-chosen for commenting upon her own boundless dominion and power. We had no claim of right to the good offices, or even good wishes, of England towards hastening the ratification. Neutrality, was all we had the right to ask. The voluntary interposition of her good wishes, whatever the motive, was to be well received; and I hold it to have been another instance of the wisdom of the foreign Secretary who then so largely swayed her foreign counsels; nor did I allow a day to pass without transmitting what he said on this occasion, to the Secretary of State.

August 29. Mr. Lowndes and Washington Irving, two of our countrymen, dine with us; the former a prominent member of the House of Representatives

from South Carolina, the latter distinguished by his literary talents. The conversation was of the United States and England, Mr. Lowndes having lately arrived. From both, there was a flow of patriotism, mingled with liberal feelings towards England.

September 3. Mr. ******* who is closely connected with some of the cabinet, informs me that a British squadron consisting of two seventy-fours and two frigates, is in active preparation at Plymouth, whence, it is expected to sail very shortly for the south seas, and that Sir Thomas Hardy is to command it. He says that it was destined for this service in consequence of the operations of Lord Cochrane's ships in those seas, and the decree of Bernardo O'Higgins, Supreme Director of Chili, of the 20th of April last, relating to blockade, which has laid the foundation for some of Lord Cochrane's proceedings. ******* said, that the British squadron would be there to watch events, not intending to let Lord Cochrane have sole command in the Pacific.

September 5. Mr. Irving dines with us, to our renewed pleasure. His social benevolence is equal to his talents and good humor. He speaks ill of no one, so that the poet's line "the tongue which, where it could not praise, was mute," might describe him.

September 7. Write to Mr. Forsyth, informing him that since my letter of the 24th of July, transmitted through Mr. Gallatin, I have assurances from Lord Castlereagh, that England not only takes no steps to defeat our treaty with Spain, but desires and seeks to promote its ratification. I especially give him the information, as, by a letter from him, I find that he labors under opposite suspicions very strongly, not having received my former letter.

September 9. Visit the brewery of Truman Hanbury and company. Young Mr. Hanbury conducted us through it. I will note a few things.

I asked if they ever got hops from the United States. The answer was, only in years when the crop was short in England, the duty upon our hops being so high as to amount to prohibition. The price in England for their own hops was stated to be, three pounds per hundred weight; this was in good seasons; last year being a very bad one, the price rose greatly higher. This had brought American hops into demand, the quality of which was better for brewing than the English; but it was said that they were injured for the English market by being dried, as was supposed, with pine wood, this being the only way in which a bad flavor imparted to them, could be accounted for. We were told that there had been brewed at the brewery

last year, two hundred and ten thousand barrels of beer, each containing thirty-six gallons. The whole was performed by a steam engine, equal to a twenty-six horse power. There were eighty vats, and three boilers.

We understood that the whole cost of the establishment, including the building, machinery implements, horses, and every thing else, together with the capital necessary to put the brewery into operation, was upwards of four hundred thousand pounds. And was this investment necessary before *beginning* the business I asked? The answer was—yes, on the scale that I saw.

The stable was scarcely the least curious part of the establishment. Ninety horses of the largest breed were employed, not as large as elephants it is true, but making one think of them; and all as fat as possible. Their food was a peck and a half of oats a day, with mangers always kept full of clover hay and cut straw, chopped up together with a machine, and hay in their racks throughout the night. It was among the largest breweries in London, but not the largest, Barclay's, established by an American, taking the lead.

After going through it all under the good auspices of Mr. Hanbury, who hospitably gave us a collation, we went to Spital-fields. There, through like obliging attentions from Mr. Hale, an eminent manu-

facturer, we saw, in several of the houses and workshops, the whole process of weaving silk, satin, and velvets.

September 12. Dined with Lord Castlereagh yesterday at his country seat, North Cray, where he goes occasionally to pass a few days at this season of relative rest to cabinet ministers, being the beginning of the shooting season. It was a dinner given to a portion of the diplomatic corps and their ladies; we had also Mr. Planta and Lord Ancram, and were invited at six o'clock. This was early for England, and may have been to afford opportunity for taking a turn before dinner along the sweet briar walk, alluded to in Chapter XVIII. of the former volume; but, if so, unhappily, we lost that chance! An accident to my carriage obliged us to stop on the road, and the consequence was, that, although the speed of the horses was increased after repairing the accident, we arrived after our time. The fifteen minutes usually allowed at English dinners, had far more than run out. As we drove up, we saw the servants had all left the hall, and we feared the company had gone to dinner. Entering the drawing room, we found this not quite the case, but they were on the eve of going, and we had been waited for. As I advanced to Lord Castlereagh to make the explanation, he at once put all apology aside by

saying, playfully, "Never mind—it is all as it should be—America being furthest off, you were entitled to more time in coming." This relieved us; and our associates of the corps who were standing by, all heard the ingenious excuse which the good breeding of our host suggested for our late arrival!

I remember nothing better in this way, than an anecdote told of the Lord Leicester who built Holkham House. One of his dinner guests on entering the room where the others were assembled, unluckily struck a barometer hanging near the door. It fell down, breaking the glass, and scattering the mercury all over the floor; on which his lordship congratulated his company on the certainty of a change of weather, then much wanted, remarking that he had never seen *the mercury in his barometer so low.* Happy thought! but did not Lord Castlereagh meet the occasion as well in what he said to me?

We went to dinner a minute or two after our arrival, one of the ambassadors, Baron Fagel, taking Lady Castlereagh on his arm, and my wife going in with Lord Castlereagh. Two pet dogs had the run of the rooms, *Venom* and *Fury*—in name only, not conduct.

If I came too late to go to the menagerie before dinner, its inmates were not forgotten at table. Lady Castlereagh said that she had now two of my countrymen in her collection, a mocking bird, and a flying

squirrel; but the bird, vexed perhaps at being stolen from its native woods, would neither mock any thing, nor sing a note of its own; and as to the squirrel, none of her efforts had been able to make it fly; still, there was one other thing she wanted from the United States—a humming bird, having never seen one. I said it would make me most happy to procure one for her if possible. Thank you, she said, but will it *hum* in England? I said I would disown it as a countryman, if it did not. Hereupon I was questioned as to the habits of this little frequenter of our arbors and porticos, where honey-suckles hang; but had to confess my shallow knowledge on this item of American natural history; on which her ladyship hinted that I was holding back, for the honor of the humming bird, not wishing to promise too much beforehand, lest it should refuse to *hum* when it got to North Cray, and so turn out no better than the mocking bird and flying squirrel!

Lord Castlereagh seemed quite disposed to indulge in a similar vein; as if invited to it by the rural and quiet scenes around him—in such contrast to his daily battles in the House of Commons. He told anecdotes of the last Westminster election, and confirmed what is said in Chapter XVI. of the former volume, of his escape from the mob, with additional and diverting particulars, narrated with a familiarity that could mingle with his bland dignity when

among the foreign ministers, without overstepping it. We had personal anecdotes from him also of the sovereigns of Europe. One or two had reference to the Emperor of Austria's fondness for hunting wild boars, and his success in that sport. His guests fell in with his own vein, and none seconded it better than Mr. Planta; a gentleman of native urbanity and long enjoying all advantages of society.

We had one anecdote relished above all the rest. I need have the less scruple in telling it, as it may be inferred that the distinguished personage to whom it relates, would himself have had no objection to its publicity. It was mentioned, that two of the servants of the Persian ambassador having offended him lately in London, he applied to the British government for permission to cut off their heads. On learning that it could not be granted, he gravely remonstrated! In the sequel, he was ill able to comprehend how the laws of England could deny his request. Finding however that his hands were tied up, he told his servants, "*it was all one; they must consider their heads as being off, for off they would come when he got them back to Persia!*"

In this manner the dinner moved on. I give little specimens only, ill-told apart from their oral spirit. We left the table at nine o'clock, and were an hour in the drawing room afterwards. Here Mr. Planta mentioned to a little knot of us, that Lord Castle-

reagh had once crossed with Lady Castlereagh from Ireland to Scotland in an open row boat—a distance of twenty-five miles. It was thought something of an adventure.

With the cup of delicious Mocha coffee in our hands, I had conversation with the Saxon minister Baron Just; and I must here mention, having omitted a note of it under its date, that this experienced member of the corps paid me a visit in the spring or summer, to talk about our intended recognition of Buenos Ayres. He said that he would not conceal his wish on that subject, having received a dispatch from his court in which it was stated that I had made some communication to Lord Castlereagh in relation to it in the winter. The precise nature of my communication, his court did not know; and it was thence his desire to learn it through me, as he had no claim to seek it through Lord Castlereagh. I frankly told him all, for which he thanked me; and it struck me as curious, that an official communication which I had made to the Foreign Secretary of England respecting a measure of foreign policy contemplated by the United States, should have passed from cabinet to cabinet in Europe, or from one ambassador to another, until, somehow or other, for it was not said exactly how, it reached the ears of the King of Saxony; whose plenipotentiary in London thus hears it, for the first time, by way of

Dresden! Had the movements of the United States become so important with Europe? or, were its smaller courts, like Saxony, the more prone to political curiosity, from being able to do nothing important themselves since the Holy Alliance existed? (When could the smaller courts *ever* do any thing important?) Be these things as they may, the veteran diplomat thanked me again this evening for having put it in his power to enlighten his court on this intended step of the government of the United States, respecting Buenos Ayres.

In a few brief words with Lord Castlereagh, I touched upon the non-ratification of our Florida treaty. He again merely said, his other guests dividing his attention, that he wished it had been otherwise, adding that he was led to infer from the communications of Sir Henry Wellesley, their ambassador at Madrid, that the refusal of Spain was not absolute, but that she only waited for some further explanations.

Before coming away, I asked it as a favor, that he would name as early a day as his convenience would allow, for letting me know the views of his government on the renewed proposals I had submitted to him in June, on the West India trade; on which he appointed the sixteenth instant, requesting I would call on him at his residence, St. James's Square.

It was now ten o'clock. Our carriages were all in waiting, the night was fine, the road good, and we got back to town at midnight from this agreeable dinner party; a delightful form of society, of which the English are chiefly fond, and all the unwritten arcana of which they understand; a form of society where restraint and ease go hand in hand, to unite the pleasures of conversation, in its lighter spheres, with the rational enjoyments of the table, heightening and refining both; and where, as the condition of the conversation being general, there must be a disciplined forbearance, under the golden requisition of which none talk too much. This, indeed, points to a high state of manners; and what training to produce it! How often have the young and unpractised held back on such occasions, where all are listening while only one speaks, lest they should fail in the apt thought and proper expression of it! Yet these are the sensibilities, this the kind of culture, out of which such society grows, until at last, as the effect of both, it becomes an unrestrained and natural scene, where there is no jarring, blended with one of intellectual accomplishments and grace; a scene, not for conflict of minds, but for easy colloquy and reciprocal pleasure; where the strife is that of concession, if there be any strife; where some minds, to be sure, will be superior to others, some able to sparkle and others not, but none struggling for mastery, or

breathing a contentious spirit. To reconcile with all these restraints, mental enjoyments in a sphere peculiarly its own and eminently delightful, is the end aimed at, and such are the characteristics of dinner parties in England in their enlightened and polished circles.

There is a charm in such society for all nations. Its standard, is of intrinsic worth and beauty. The educated and accomplished every where, appreciate its meliorating influences; rich and flourishing republics, have the elements of it; and it raises the moral tone of conduct in other spheres, by the restraints it imposes upon the temper and feelings. It serves to lay a curb upon both, on the important occasions of life, such as that which is seen in the intercourse of refined social life.

September 16. The scene changes. It is no longer the tranquil hospitality of North Cray. Lord Castlereagh and his guest of last Thursday, meet to-day by appointment, to discuss matters of international concern; in the spirit indeed in which his lordship discusses and transacts all public business —that of courtesy; but when, like his guest, he has important interests of his country in charge, which guest and host are primarily bound to look to, neither giving way to the other but as public duty may dictate.

His lordship began the interview by taking from his table the proposals I had submitted to him respecting the West India trade on the 13th of June. He premised, that it would be more convenient perhaps to answer them as the British articles submitted through my predecessor in London in 1817, had been answered; namely, without any formal written communication, but simply in conversation with me. I said that the form of the answer would, I was sure, make no difference with my government; its communication in any mode, would do.

He proceeded to inform me that our proposals were not of a nature to form the basis of an agreement between the two countries for the regulation of this trade; they would effect, if adopted, an entire subversion of the British colonial system; from which system they were not prepared to depart. Their colonies were, in many respects, burdensome he said, and even liable to involve the parent state in wars. Garrisons and other establishments were constantly maintained in them, at heavy expense. In return, it was no more than just that they should be brought under regulations, the operation of which would help to meet in part the expenses which they created. The great principle of these regulations was known to be, the reservation of an exclusive right in the governing power to the benefit of the trade of the colonies, a principle relaxed it was true

by the Free Port acts; but it had never been the intention of his Majesty's government to do any thing more than make us the offer of a participation in those acts. Some modifications of them would have been acquiesced in, suggested by local causes, and an anxious desire that our two countries might come to an understanding on this part of their commercial intercourse; but our proposals went the length of breaking down the system entirely, and could not therefore be accepted. Such were his remarks.

I said, that to break down the system was no part of our aim. All we desired was, that the trade, as far as opened to us at all, should be opened to the vessels of both nations upon terms that were equal. If the system fell under such an arrangement, it was as an incident, and only served to show how difficult it seemed to render its longer continuance consistent with a fair measure of commercial justice towards the United States.

His lordship's rejection of our proposals was so broad and decided, that it appeared at first almost superfluous to ask him to be more particular; yet, on my wish, he went on to assign reasons.

The first objection then he said to our proposals was, that we asked a specification of all the ports in the West Indies to which we desired the privilege of admission.

We had asked, secondly, that the trade between the United States and the British colonies on the continent of North America, and with Bermuda, should be confined within the same limits, as the trade between the United States and the British West Indies, carried on in the direct path.

And, in the third place, we had asked that the duties on articles imported from the United States into the British West India Islands in American vessels, should be no higher than on the same articles when imported from the United States in British vessels, or when imported from any *other* country, without saying any other *foreign* country.

These three points, especially the third and second, formed, he said, insurmountable obstacles to any convention or arrangement with the United States, purporting to embrace them.

In reply I remarked, that, as to the first objection, it was plain, that if the ports were not specifically named, the privilege of admission to them might at any time be recalled when Great Britain thought fit to exclude from them any other foreign vessels; it would be a privilege with nothing certain; vessels of the United States beginning a lawful voyage, might find it unlawful before it ended. As to the second objection I said, that should an indirect trade be opened with the Islands in any greater extent than the direct trade, nothing appeared more obvious

than that the greater part or whole would soon flow in the channel of the former, to the manifest disadvantage of America, and preference of British vessels.

The stress, I admitted, was on the third objection; and as to that, an explanatory remark or two was all that I would add to what we had urged heretofore. That the United States should ask, or expect to cut Britain off from exercising her undoubted right of protecting the industry of her own subjects in any part of her dominions by establishing discriminating duties in their favor, might be thought at first blush, altogether indefensible; but, on examination, we believed it would be found otherwise under all the actual circumstances of this trade. The system built up by Great Britain in relation to her colonies, must be viewed altogether. It was so artificial, that principles not disputed in the abstract, lost that character in their practical application to other nations. Though one and all of these colonies, were, indeed, of her own dominion, yet they were made by British legislation, to stand with respect to the United States, on the footing of separate and independent countries. Jamaica, for example, was as one country to them; Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, as another; whilst the *whole* of the United States were made to present to Great Britain but *one* country, commercially; although the ex-

tremes of their widely extended territory comprised almost as great a variety of industry and productions, as Great Britain proper, and her West India Islands. This was the root of the difficulty. To the British West India Islands, certain supplies were desirable; and which, if they did not get from their own North American colonies, they could get no where else, upon terms to invite an advantageous trade, except from the United States. If therefore *we* agreed not to impose upon articles imported into the United States from the British West Indies, any higher duties than upon similar articles coming from any other *foreign* country, an agreement by *Great Britain* not to impose on articles exported from the United States to her Islands, any higher duties than on similar articles when brought from any other *foreign* country, would be one of only *nominal* reciprocity; because, after her own dominions on the continent of North America, there was no other *foreign* country *except the United States*, from which such articles would be sent. Thus it was, that our third proposition, combined with the two others, was indispensable to enable the United States, whilst carrying on trade with the British West Indies, to place their navigation on a footing of real equality, not that which was merely verbal. The former was the only footing upon which any compact

between the two countries could be satisfactory or lasting.

His lordship did not accede to these views; and each government appearing to have made up its mind on the subject, the discussion was not prolonged. He did not suffer it to close without adding, that although our proposals were declined, it was in a spirit no other than friendly and frank; we might resort to any just and rightful regulations of our own, to meet those which Britain deemed it necessary to adhere to, in regard to her West India Islands; it would form no ground of complaint whatever, on the part of His Majesty's government. I also said in conclusion, that this might naturally be expected to be the course which the United States would adopt, as had before been intimated to His Majesty's government; and adopted certainly in no unfriendly spirit, but with a view to secure for their citizens what their government believed to be equal rights in trade. The subject was now disposed of. It remained at rest until revived at a subsequent negotiation to be mentioned hereafter; each nation in the meantime pursuing its own independent policy.

His lordship passed to another subject. He adverted spontaneously to the Florida treaty. He did so, to corroborate his former communications to me. He took from his table some of Sir Henry Wellesley's dispatches from Madrid, and read passages from

a couple of them, showing that that ambassador had made known to the Spanish Cabinet, the wishes of the British government for the ratification of our treaty. He also read me a passage from one of his own dispatches to the ambassador, in which an unequivocal opinion was expressed, that the true interests of Spain would be best promoted by a ratification.

He next asked if I had heard, during the summer, of an intended visit of a Mr. ****** to London. I replied that I had. He said he had too, but that he had not, in fact, arrived. The Spanish government knew too well the opinion of His Majesty's government to imagine that the propositions with which ****** was charged, could ever be countenanced. These, he continued, were, to ask a loan of money from England to pay the American claims recognized by the Florida treaty; and also to inquire if Great Britain would consent to make common cause with Spain, in the event of a rupture between the latter and the United States.* His lordship then stated, that the willingness of the British Court to acquiesce in our possession of the Floridas, might be inferred from the indirect offer which it had made two years ago to mediate between the United States

* This sheds some light on the anonymous communications mentioned in Chapter XV. of the former volume. I naturally supposed that Britain would countenance no such propositions, though not then knowing what Lord Castlereagh told me in this interview.

and Spain, which we had declined. This offer, he remarked, was made on the supposition that the cession of these provinces to us, would have formed the basis of the negotiation; and to such a basis Britain was prepared at that time to consent, whatever her opinions formerly.

His lordship also put into my hands at this interview, something not to have been read without the interest attaching in diplomatic life, to what proceeds from high sources. It was a letter addressed to him by Sir Charles Stuart, the British ambassador in Paris, relating to an anecdote in which the Duchess d'Angoulême and Mr. Gallatin were the parties. It stated that at a court just held by the king of France, the Duchess pointedly asked Mr. Gallatin, in the hearing of others of the diplomatic corps, if British interference had not been at the bottom of the rejection of our treaty with Spain! Mr. Gallatin replied no, that so far from it, Great Britain had endeavoured to promote an issue directly the contrary. Sir Charles adds, that he thanked Mr. Gallatin for the justice rendered his court, but hinted a wish that the contradiction might not be urged further. The meaning of this caution I inferred to be, that as the Duchess ought not to have harbored the suspicion which her question implied without adequate grounds, the question, publicly proceeding as it did from a source in such close connexion with

the French throne, had little claim to more than one contradiction.

In the course of the interview, his lordship glanced at the pretexts under which Spain withheld her consent to the treaty, as he had learned them through Sir Henry Wellesley. These, in a word, were, though his lordship did not go into them, an allegation by Spain, that the United Sates desired to alter one of the articles of the treaty, by making certain declarations as to its meaning, when the ratifications were to be exchanged; and next, that the government of the United States had sanctioned an expedition against the Spanish province of Texas; both which allegations were shown in the end to be groundless.

September 18. Had another interview with Lord Castlereagh, on his invitation sent to me this morning. It was for the purpose of informing me, that the choice of the Prince Regent had fallen upon Mr. Stratford Canning, as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary from England to the United States, in the room of Mr. Bagot, who was appointed ambassador to the court of St. Petersburgh.

In selecting this gentleman, his lordship said, that the Prince Regent had been actuated by an anxious desire to keep up the system of conciliation, which had been acted upon with so much advantage to both

countries by Mr. Bagot; and his Royal Highness had the best reasons for believing that he possessed every qualification for treading in the same path.

In speaking more particularly of Mr. Canning, he carried back his narrative to 1812. That year found him, he said, in the post of Secretary to the British embassy at Constantinople. The ambassador being called away, Mr. Canning, under dormant credentials, which, according to usage in the diplomatic service of England, he was possessed of, stood at the head of the embassy, with the rank and functions of Minister Plenipotentiary. In this situation, important duties fell upon him, which he performed in a manner highly satisfactory; but he attracted the favorable notice of his government chiefly by services which he rendered, as auxiliary to the conclusion of a treaty between the Ottoman Porte and Russia; accomplishing an object dear at that time to Great Britain.* He was soon afterwards appointed minister to Switzerland. This, although not generally a leading station, was converted by events into a conspicuous theatre for the display of his fitness for a high diplomatic trust. Being there when the sovereigns of Europe were assembled at Vienna in 1815, and questions of interest, as well

* Russia and Turkey being at war, this treaty effected peace between them, thus liberating Russian troops from that service to go against Napoleon; as the treaty between Persia and Russia, already mentioned, had disengaged them from service against Persia.

between the states of Switzerland themselves as between some of them and France, coming up for consideration, Mr. Canning was requested to give his attendance at the congress. Thither he repaired, and from the usefulness of his information, and discretion of his counsels, left upon all minds the best impressions. Returning to his station, he remained until a few months ago, faithfully and ably discharging his duties; when, as was believed for some domestic reasons, he requested his recall.

Such was the account his lordship gave me. He added, that his appointment to the United States, was to be considered as the proper reward of past services. He mentioned that he would be made a privy counsellor, the Prince Regent intending to annex that dignity to his Minister Plenipotentiary to the United States. He further spoke of Mr. Canning as joining to his abilities, personal dispositions kind and conciliatory.

I thanked him for his communication, telling him of the pleasure I should have in imparting it to my government.

In the evening, I dined with Mr. Lyttelton at Putney. We had a small but agreeable party. It could not have been otherwise in a circle where Lady Sarah Lyttelton lent her aid to the cordial hospitality of Mr. Lyttelton. Captain Spencer of the navy, was of the company. He expected soon

to sail in his frigate, the Owen Glendower, for the Pacific, as part of Sir Thomas Hardy's squadron. This frigate was built with the round stern, the first of that description, according to the plan of Sir Robert Seppings, which the admiralty had adopted. The "round stern" was talked of, and conversation enlivened and diversified by many other topics.

Mr. Lyttelton afterwards became Lord Lyttelton, heir of Hagley, and Lady Lyttelton, mistress of that elegant abode. There, at that classic seat, it was once my lot to pass a Christmas week, with a youthful son; the mansion enlivened by other company, and every thing to render hospitality attractive. Lord Lyttelton died soon afterwards, to the unfeigned regret of his American guest and friend, who would here pay a fleeting, but sincere tribute to his virtues. After the death of Lord Lyttelton, the accomplished mind of Lady Lyttelton, pure principles, and mingled sprightliness and dignity, pointed her out, among the illustrious matrons of England, for the high trust of superintending the education of the children of the present Queen; a situation which I believe, she now holds in the palace.

September 29. Mr. Stratford Canning, the newly appointed minister to the United States, and several of the diplomatic corps dine with us; also Mr. Planta. Mr. Canning manifests in conversation

every desire to render the mission in his hands subservient to harmony and good will between the two countries.

October 2. Mr. * * * * * visits me. He says the Spanish ambassador is very uneasy under the armament fitting out in Ireland in aid of the revolted colonies. He remonstrates, but ineffectually, against it. He adds that the subject makes a talk in the diplomatic circle.

Getting on other topics, he was led to speak of allowances to some of the ambassadors. The Austrian ambassador, he said, received ten thousand ducats a year. The Russian got more; but the Austrian, besides the above sum from his government, had the same amount annually allowed him by his father, the elder Prince Esterhazy. The French ambassador he believed, received twelve thousand sterling a year, with an allowance for occasional entertainments. The foreign secretary of England, he added, was also allowed for entertainments. He further stated, that France gave her ambassador *in London*, two thousand pounds a year *more* than her ambassadors at any other court. Speaking of British ambassadors abroad he said, that a service of plate as a personal gift to them, had lately been discontinued. The plate was now considered as attached to the embassy, and had the

public arms upon it. To her ministers plenipotentiary, England gave no service of plate, but made some extra allowance in lieu. This was the information he gave on these matters, saying that, by as much as he had heard, he believed it not far from the truth.

CHAPTER XII.

DINNER AT THE TRAVELLER'S CLUB. ARMAMENTS IN AID OF THE SPANISH AMERICAN CAUSE. DINNER AT BARON FAGEL'S, AMBASSADOR FROM THE NETHERLANDS. PRIZES TAKEN BY THE SPANISH AMERICANS, NOT ADMITTED INTO ENGLISH PORTS. INTERVIEW WITH LORD CASTLEREAGH ON THE SLAVE TRADE. OFFICIAL NOTES ON THAT SUBJECT—AND PARLIAMENTARY ADDRESSES.

October 4. Dine at the Traveller's Club. A party of about ten are at table, made up of English gentlemen and the diplomatic corps. This club consists I was told of four hundred members, noblemen and gentlemen. One of the requisites to membership is, that the applicant should have travelled at least five hundred miles out of England. The Club House is a large one in Waterloo Place, not far from Carlton House. Besides the beautiful library of the club, the rooms are abundantly supplied with newspapers, periodical works, chess boards, and all things else usual in these great establishments as

they exist in London. The rent of the house without furniture, was stated to be a thousand guineas a year. Looking at the regulations, I observed that one of them prohibited dice, and allowed no game of hazard in the rooms of the club.

At seven we sat down to a dinner served on silver, and attended by liveried servants. Every body seemed at home. Mr. Planta was of the party, and a good contributor to the conversation. There was no *swearing*, any more than at private tables in England—which I have never heard. Talking with Mr. ***** on that rule of the club, by which one black ball excludes, he agreed to what I had heard remarked at Lord Westmoreland's; namely, that to have had *two* duels, would be likely to exclude any candidate without further scrutiny; a quarrelsome temper, or something akin to it, would be inferred. He admitted duelling to be unavoidable in the existing state of manners; but said that experience proved it to be very rare in private society among the best gentlemen in England, who always understood each other. All the members of the diplomatic corps had the freedom of this club extended to them; and this was far from being the only time I dined there, in the midst of enlightened and agreeable circles.

October 5. I learn from good authority, that in

addition to an armament already dispatched from Ireland to aid the Spanish colonists, from two to three thousand men will soon follow; their first destination to be Margaritta. They will be under the command of General Devereux, a native of Ireland, but long a citizen of the United States, resident in Baltimore, an honorable man, and reputed a good soldier. He intends to embark, in person, with this force. The law is evaded by the men going out under color of settling as farmers and laborers in the province of Venezuela. The better to mask his project, it is said that General Devereux has received either an actual or ostensible grant from General Bolivar of fifty square leagues of land in that province.

It has been remarked, quaintly, as illustrating the difficulty of framing penal statutes which could not be evaded in England, that the only statute out of which the subject could not creep, was the old one for burying in woollen. It is a hard task to execute laws where public opinion is against them. In Ireland, it is known that attachment to the cause of the colonists has become very general. In England, it is strong in powerful commercial circles, and even in some others. But whence are derived the pecuniary supplies necessary for so large an expedition as the one now fitting out in Ireland, seems not easy to discover. It is said that General Devereux

does it on his own means; but troops are raised and equipped, transports hired, munitions provided, and a large enterprise in all things completed, for active military operations. All this would appear to be an undertaking too much for private means. The General has his head quarters at a hotel in Dublin, wears a military dress, and has aids about him. It seems difficult to reconcile all this with the strict enforcement of the Foreign Enlistment bill, passed to stop aid from going to the Spanish colonists; but facts must speak for themselves, and my informant can scarcely be in error, having *seen* part of what he mentions, and being too honorable to misstate things. I communicate to my government all that he tells me.

October 6. Dine with Baron Fagel, ambassador from the Netherlands. The company was composed of foreigners chiefly, with some English gentlemen. Amongst the former was a youth of about fifteen, a native of Java, dressed in the fashion of his country, who had lately come to London with a public functionary of Holland, arrived from that island. His behaviour was remarkable. At table, he retained his self-possession with entire modesty; and what was more striking, seemed at fault in none of the conventional forms of the dinner. This was observed by all. So it is, that native aptitudes will sometimes

greatly supply the want of previous training, even for the nicest occasions of social life; like those intellects which, in regions of thought more important, can go on, from conclusion to conclusion, without the intermediate processes necessary to others.

Mr. Barrow,* of the admiralty, was of the company, and talked with his usual command of resources for conversation. Ship building being spoken of, one of his remarks was, that, as a science, it was still in its infancy; hitherto, in England, it had been in the hands, almost exclusively, he added, of practical men merely. Mr. Hammond, British minister to the United States in General Washington's time, was among the guests. I found him still familiar with some of the incidents of our government at that early day, when the French revolution raged, and party spirit, among us, rested chiefly on an espousal of the cause of one or other of the great belligerents, France or England.

October 8. I am informed that Mr. Irisari, a deputy from Chili, has had an informal interview with Lord Castlereagh. He asked whether the vessels of Chili would not be admitted into the ports of Britain? His lordship replied, certainly—at all times. Would their prizes, also? Here Lord Castlereagh made objection, saying that such a permis-

* Afterwards Sir John Barrow, Bart.

sion might give cause of complaint to Spain. His lordship then said, that Sir Thomas Hardy, who was appointed to command the squadron destined to act in the south seas, was charged to attend to British interests in that quarter, and would be the medium of any communications necessary between his own government and the authorities of Chili, and thus exercise, in effect, consular functions. The deputy inquired, if Great Britain would not, in return, receive a consul from Chili? His lordship answered, that such reciprocity did not appear to follow as a duty, Chili being not yet recognized by other nations as an established power; but he said, that the instructions to Sir Thomas Hardy directed him to pay respect to all the just regulations of trade and commerce, established by those exercising the powers of Government in Chili.

October 10. We were at Drury Lane last night. Guy Mannering was the play, and "Scots wha' ha' wi' Wallace bled," was sung by Braham, long a famous singer, whom we had not heard before. The song, which breathes the spirit of freedom and heroism, was enthusiastically applauded, and encored twice. The Duke of Kent was present. "God save the King" was sung by all the performers, the band playing it, and the curtain rising, as well as the audience, when he first entered his box. This

member of the Royal family, seems a favorite General Harper remarked after a conversation of a few minutes with him at the levee, that although unable to judge of his intellectual powers in an interview so brief, he was struck with his well-selected words and clear enunciation of them. Mentioning my countryman General Harper in this connexion, I feel impelled to add, that he had a mind stored with knowledge, and by the union of indomptable industry with native talents, and a desire for honorable distinction, stood in the front rank of professional and public fame in our country; whilst allied by marriage to the Carroll family of Maryland, whose illustrious head obtained the appellation of "*The last of the Signers*,"* he derived and imparted advantage from that estimable connexion.

November 9. On the 4th instant, Lord Castlereagh wrote me the following note:

Lord Castlereagh presents his compliments to Mr. Rush, and will be happy to have the honor of seeing him at eleven o'clock A. M., the 5th instant, if that hour is not inconvenient to Mr. Rush.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *November* 4, 1819.

Through an accident the note did not get to my

*He was a signer of the Declaration of Independence and survived all the others.

hands, until the evening of the fifth, and intermediate notes between us having arranged this day (the ninth,) for the interview, it accordingly took place. It was a subject his lordship had much at heart—that of the slave trade. After a word of explanation on the short notice given in his first note, which arose from his being still partly at North Cray and partly in town, he remarked, that the government of Great Britain had lost none of its anxiety to see a more universal and effective cooperation among independent states, for putting down the traffick. It was still carried on he said to a lamentable extent; and in some respects, as evidence collected by the African Institution and from other sources would show, was marked by more than all its original outrages upon humanity. It was the intention of the Prince Regent again to invite the United States to negotiate upon the subject, in the hope, notwithstanding what had hitherto passed, that some practicable mode might yet be found by which they could yield their assent to an association with other powers for accomplishing the object all had in view. That I was aware of the addresses to the Prince Regent presented by both Houses of Parliament at the close of the last session, for the renewal of negotiations with foreign powers, naming especially the United States and France, for rendering more effectual the laws passed for abolishing the trade; and

that in consequence of this step it was his intention to enclose to me, at an early day, copies of these addresses, as the foundation of a new endeavor which His Majesty's government was now about to make with that of the United States. In doing so his purpose at present merely was, to bespeak my interposition towards making known to the President the measures contemplated, it being intended that all future negotiation should be carried on at Washington. This he thought indispensable after the past failure, as it could not be supposed that I was prepared with any new authority or instructions to resume negotiations on this side of the water. That their newly appointed minister, Mr. Canning, who, his lordship now informed me, would embark early in the spring, would accordingly have the subject in charge, and be prepared to enter upon it on his arrival at Washington, under hopes the most anxious of an auspicious termination to his labors.

I replied that I would, as before, be happy to make known to my government, whatever communication he might honor me with. I adverted again to the obstacles which the constitution of the United States interposed to the project of naval concert with foreign powers, and to the peculiar and extreme caution with which the question of search, would be viewed throughout our country. I said that these reasons strongly superadded themselves to the

failure of the attempt already made here, to give a propriety to changing the place of negotiation, and therefore I was very glad to learn that the new endeavor was to be made at Washington. I believed that the President had all his original sensibility to the importance of the subject, and I could not doubt but that he would receive any proposals from His Majesty's government, differently modified from the last, with an earnest desire to turn them to good ends, as far as might be practicable, towards suppressing the traffic. I remarked, that as England had declared, that the principles of the Holy Alliance had her approbation, though she was no formal party to it, so the United States, acting within their constitutional limits, had long and earnestly desired, as much so as the powers of Europe possibly could, to see the slave trade abolished, although unable to be a formal party with them in the work. Here I adverted to what Lord Liverpool said last winter in the House of Peers; viz. that as the signatures of the European Sovereigns to the Holy Alliance were all by their own hands, England could not join in it, as the Prince Regent was restrained, by the fundamental doctrine of the British constitution, from giving his autograph signature, without the intervention of a responsible minister. With such an illustration as this, I remarked to his lordship, that the embarrassment

which met us under our constitutional system of government, might perhaps be the more readily seen. He admitted it, but expressed hopes that such and all other embarrassments might in the end be overcome by proper modifications of the plan in question.

The interview, after some incidental conversation growing out of the general subject, here closed.

In the evening I dined with my friend, Mr. George Marx, Bedford-Place, a merchant connected with the American trade; known for his mercantile intelligence and general information, not less than for his private worth, and hospitable attention to Americans.

November 14. Received a note from Lord Castlereagh, dated the eleventh instant, in fulfilment of his intention made known to me in the foregoing interview. It covered manuscript copies of the address presented to the Prince Regent by both Houses of Parliament, to which his lordship had referred. The following is a copy of his note:

The undersigned, His Majesty's principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, has the honor to transmit to Mr. Rush, by command of the Prince Regent, a copy of addresses which were presented by both Houses of Parliament at the close of the last session to His Royal Highness, which His Royal Highness has to request Mr. Rush will lay before

the President, with an intimation that it is the Prince Regent's earnest desire to enter without delay into discussion with the government of the United States upon the important subject to which these addresses refer, and in the successful accomplishment of which, the common feelings and reputation of both States, are equally and deeply involved.

It has occurred to the Prince Regent, that the difficulties which have hitherto operated to prevent a common system of concert and prevention between the two governments, as directed against the illicit slave trade, could be most satisfactorily examined by selecting Washington as the seat of deliberation. Under this impression the undersigned has delayed to transmit to Mr. Rush the addresses in question, till he could accompany them with some proposition to be conveyed to the government of the United States for giving practical effect to the views of Parliament. The undersigned having lately had the honor of acquainting Mr. Rush that Mr. Stratford Canning had been selected by the Prince Regent to replace Mr. Bagot as his Envoy and minister Plenipotentiary in America, and as that gentleman will proceed to his mission early in the spring, and will carry with him full instructions on this subject, the undersigned has to request Mr. Rush will invite his government on the part of the Prince Regent, to

enter as soon as may be after Mr. Canning's arrival, upon the proposed discussions.

Upon a subject so deeply interesting to humanity, the government of the United States can never require any other impulse than that of its moral principles, to awaken it to exertion; but whatever of aid, good offices can contribute to smooth the way for an amicable and advantageous proceeding on such a matter, the undersigned is convinced will be supplied by Mr. Rush's zeal, and enlightened attachment to the success of the great cause which the inquiry involves; and in this view the recommendation is specially commended, to his personal support and protection.

The undersigned avails himself of this opportunity, to renew to Mr. Rush the assurances of his distinguished consideration.

CASTLEREAGH.

FOREIGN OFFICE, 11*th November*, 1819.

November 16. To the above note, I returned the following answer:

The undersigned, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary from the United States, has the honor to present his compliments to Lord Castlereagh, and to acknowledge the receipt of his note of the eleventh of this month.

The copy of the addresses to the Prince Regent

from both Houses of Parliament, at the close of the last session, respecting the slave trade, which, by command of his Royal Highness, came enclosed in Lord Castlereagh's note, with a request that they might be laid before the President, the undersigned will lose no time in transmitting to the Secretary of State with that view. The intimation of its being the earnest desire of the Prince Regent to enter, without delay, into discussions with the United States upon the important subject to which these addresses refer, and in the successful accomplishment of which, the two nations have a common interest, will, the undersigned is persuaded, be met by his government, in the same spirit which has given birth to the desire in the mind of his Royal Highness.

The undersigned cannot avoid expressing his acquiescence in the opinion, that the difficulties which have hitherto operated to prevent a system of concert between the two governments, against the illicit slave trade, are most likely to be satisfactorily examined, by selecting Washington as the seat of deliberation. If, happily, they are of a nature to be removed, it is by such a transfer of the seat of a new endeavor, that the best hopes may be formed; and it is hence, with peculiar satisfaction, the undersigned learns that Mr. Canning, when proceeding on his mission to the United States, will carry with him such full instructions on the whole subject, as may

prepare him for entering upon the interesting duty of giving effect to the views of Parliament. The undersigned will not fail to make known this intention to his government, by the earliest opportunity he can command.

Upon a subject so universally interesting to humanity, Lord Castlereagh has justly inferred, that the government of the United States can never require any other incentive, than that of its own moral impulse to awaken it to exertion. But if, upon the present occasion, it needed any other, the undersigned must be permitted to say, that it would be abundantly found in the friendly and enlarged spirit of this renewed overture from his Royal Highness, the Prince Regent; and in the liberal justice rendered to the early and steadfast efforts of the United States to abolish the slave trade, by the addresses in question from the Parliament of this realm. Following up their uniform policy in this great cause, never tired of adopting new expedients of prohibition where new evasions have pointed to their necessity, the undersigned is happy to be able to state, feeling sure that the information cannot be otherwise than acceptable to the unwearied and useful zeal of Lord Castlereagh in the same cause, that, besides the law of April, 1818, of which the undersigned had the honor to speak in his note of the twenty-first of December of that year,

a subsequent act of Congress, of date so recent as last March, has raised up additional means for the extirpation of the traffick. By this act, the President is specially authorized to employ armed vessels of the United States to cruise upon the coasts of Africa, and other new provisions are introduced for intercepting and punishing such delinquent citizens of the United States, as may be found engaged in the traffick. It is well known that the sentiments of the President are in full harmony with those of Congress, in the beneficent desire of putting a stop to this deep-rooted evil. With such pledges before the world, the undersigned cannot err, in confidently anticipating that the fresh proposals of his Royal Highness, the Prince Regent, will be promptly taken up at Washington, under the deepest convictions of their importance, and with every anxious desire for such favorable results, as can be made compatible with the constitution, and other essential interests of the republic.

The undersigned is happy to embrace this occasion of renewing to Lord Castlereagh the assurances of his distinguished consideration.

RICHARD RUSH.

LONDON, *November* 16, 1819.

Allusion being made in the above answer, to the justice which the parliamentary addresses render to

the United States in connexion with this subject, I insert one of them, that its words may be seen. I take the one from the House of Lords.

Die Veneris, 9 *Julie*, 1819.

Ordered, *Nemine Dissentiente*, by the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in Parliament assembled, that an humble address, &c.

Resolved, That an humble address be presented to His Royal Highness the Prince Regent, to assure His Royal Highness that we acknowledge with becoming thankfulness the zealous and persevering efforts which in conformity with former addresses of this House, his Royal Highness has made for accomplishing the total annihilation of the African slave trade by all the Foreign Powers whose subjects had hitherto been engaged in it.

That we also congratulate His Royal Highness on the success with which his efforts have been already attended, that guilty traffick having been declared by the concurrent voice of all the great powers of Europe assembled in congress, to be repugnant to the principles of humanity and of universal morality.

That in consequence of this declaration, all the States whose subjects were formerly concerned in this criminal traffick, have since prohibited it, the greater part absolutely and entirely; some for a time partially, on that part of the cost of Africa only, which is to

the north of the line. Of the two States which still tolerate the traffick, one will soon cease to be thus distinguished, the period which Spain has solemnly fixed for the total abolition of the trade, being near at hand. One power alone,* has hitherto forborne to specify any period when the traffick shall be absolutely abandoned.

That the United States of America, were honorably distinguished as the first which pronounced the condemnation of this guilty traffick; and that they have since successively passed various laws for carrying their prohibition into effect: that nevertheless we cannot but hear with feelings of deep regret, that notwithstanding the strong condemnation of the crime by all the great powers of Europe, and by the United States of America, there is reason to fear that the measures which have been hitherto adopted for actually suppressing these crimes, are not adequate to their purpose.

That we never however can admit the persuasion, that so great and generous a people as that of France, which has condemned this guilty commerce in the strongest terms, will be less earnest than ourselves to wipe away so foul a blot in the character of a Christian people.

That we are if possible still less willing to admit such a supposition in the instance of the United

* Portugal.

States, a people derived originally from the same common stock with ourselves, and favored like ourselves, in a degree hitherto perhaps unequalled in the history of the world, with the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty, and all their attendant blessings.

That the consciousness that the government of this country was originally instrumental in leading the Americans into this criminal course, must naturally prompt us to call on them the more importunately to join us in endeavoring to put an entire end to the evils of which it is productive.

That we also conceive that the establishment of some concert and cooperation in the measures to be taken by the different powers for the execution of their common purpose, may in various respects be of great practical utility, and that under the impression of this persuasion, several of the European States have already entered into conventional arrangements for seizing vessels engaged in the criminal traffick, and for bringing to punishment those who shall still be guilty of these nefarious practices.

That we therefore supplicate his Royal Highness to renew his beneficent endeavors, more especially with the governments of France and of the United States of America, for the effectual attainment of an object which we all profess equally to have in view; and we cannot but indulge the confident hope that these efforts may yet ere long produce their desired

effect, may ensure the practical enforcement of principles universally acknowledged to be undeniably just and true, and may destroy for ever that fatal barrier which by obstructing the ordinary course of civilization and social improvement, has so long kept a large portion of the globe in darkness and barbarism, and rendered its connexion with the civilized and Christian nations of the earth, a fruitful source only of wretchedness and desolation.

Ordered,

That the said address be presented to His Royal Highness the Prince Regent by the lords with white staves.

The address from the House of Commons was the same, or with no substantial variations.

November 17. The following letter to Mr. Gallatin, belonging to subjects on which I have heretofore addressed him, is inserted as closing the information I gave him respecting our joint negotiation.

LONDON, *November* 17, 1819.

DEAR SIR,

I ought, before now, to have apprized you of the issue of my attempt to arrange the subject of the West India trade with this government. Considering all that you did a twelve-month ago here, upon that and other branches of our joint negotiation, I

think you have a fair claim to know how it has ended. I cannot put you in possession of this information better than by conveying to your hands a copy of my report to the department of State, drawn up the day after my interview with Lord Castlereagh on the sixteenth of September. It is accordingly enclosed in this letter.

My last dates from the department are to the 23d of August. I am informed by them, as doubtless you have been, of the course to be pursued, so far as the executive determination is concerned, under the refusal by Spain to ratify the Florida treaty. Mr. Forsyth writes to me that Ferdinand persists in his refusal.

* * * * * * * *

* * * * * * * *

I believe I have not yet thanked you for your favor of the 12th of September, which gave me valuable information. I had never before heard with certainty, that, pending the negotiation at Washington about the Floridas, we had unequivocally refused to connect with it any question about recognizing the Spanish colonies. The contrary, you may recollect, was affirmed almost universally in the British journals. I never believed it, and so expressed myself on all occasions, but had not the means of positive contradiction.

We are all well, and unite in remembrances to Mrs. Gallatin, Miss Frances, and the young gentlemen.

From, Dear Sir,
Yours with faithful respect,
RICHARD RUSH.

ALBERT GALLATIN, Esquire,
Envoy Extraordinary and
Minister Plenipotentiary
from the United States—Paris.

CHAPTER XIII.

NUMBER OF AMERICAN VESSELS IN BRITISH PORTS. DINNER AT THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER'S. OPENING OF PARLIAMENT—AN EARLY SESSION CALLED ON ACCOUNT OF THE DISTURBED STATE OF THE COUNTRY. LEVEE AT CARLTON HOUSE. FETE AT THE SPANISH AMBASSADOR'S—THE HORSE GUARDS CALLED OUT. DUTY ON TOBACCO, SNUFF AND HOPS. DINNER AT MR. COLQUHOUN'S. INTERVIEW ON OFFICIAL SUBJECTS WITH LORD CASTLEREAGH. ENGLAND CONSENTS TO THE EMPEROR OF RUSSIA AS UMPIRE UNDER THE DISPUTED ARTICLE OF THE TREATY OF GHENT.

November 19. In a dispatch of to-day to the Secretary of State, I mention the following facts: viz. that at the close of last month there were but *two* vessels of the United States in the port of Liverpool; and during the first week of the present month, only a single one in the port of London.

The number of United States vessels annually arriving at Liverpool before and since the war of

1812, has frequently been from three to four hundred, sometimes more, the most of them ships of good size; and the arrivals at London since the spring of 1815, until the close of 1818, have been sixty-four annually, taking the average.

The extraordinary falling off is ascribed to the numerous commercial failures, and to the depression of business generally in the United States; of which the condition of the state banks, and bank of the United States, is given as one of the causes. Many of these institutions have failed, and others been greatly embarrassed in their affairs; whilst all the resources and energies of the country, remain the same.

At seven in the evening, I went to dinner at the Chancellor of Exchequer's, where we had several of the diplomatic corps and other company. Again we were in the dining room of Mr. Pitt and Sir Robert Walpole, with memorials of the times of each around us; and none were better able to call them up, with appropriate anecdote and allusions at his table, than our hospitable entertainer.

November 24. Parliament was opened yesterday by the Prince Regent in person. I was in the ambassador's box, with the rest of the diplomatic corps. As the Regent read his speech, the Duke of Wellington stood on the throne by his side, holding the

sword of state. The speech began as usual with announcing in terms of regret, the continued indisposition of the King; and it told both Houses that his Royal Highness continued to receive from foreign powers, the strongest assurances of their friendly disposition towards England.

Parliament has been opened at a day unusually early, and the speech assigns the disturbed state of the country as the cause. Seditious practices stated to have been prevalent in some of the manufacturing districts, (Manchester, and the riots in that vicinity in August, being chiefly meant,) had led ministers to make some addition to the military force, with a view to their more effectual suppression. For this step, they desire the sanction of Parliament, as well as for other measures contemplated by them in aid of the public tranquillity, and due execution of the laws.

The usual address, reflecting back the speech and adopting its sentiments, was moved in both Houses, but strongly opposed by Earl Grey in the House of Lords, and Mr. Tierney in the House of Commons; each of whom moved an amendment. After debate, the ministers triumphed by large majorities in both Houses, thus carrying the address as it stood.

The speech had also a paragraph relating to the depression existing in certain branches of the manufactures, and consequent distress among those connected with them. Speakers in both Houses whilst

handling that part of it, made allusions to distresses existing in the United States, some of them alleging that they were more general and severe than in England. Even the speech from the throne stated, that the depressed condition of the manufactures was in a great measure to be ascribed to the embarrassed situation of "*other countries.*"

It is worthy of remark on the other hand, that in the United States, our newspapers and public documents ascribed our distress in a great degree to the depressed condition of business and industry abroad, but chiefly to the distress in England.

Both, to a certain extent, were true; and what can more show the dependence of countries one upon another? And may I not, in this connexion, be allowed to recall the declarations made to Mr. Gallatin and me by Lord Castlereagh, when opening an important negotiation between the two countries at North Cray? Upon that occasion, amongst other sentiments which he uttered, he said, "Let us, in short, strive so to regulate our intercourse in all respects, as that each nation may be able to do its utmost towards making the other rich and happy."

A liberal sentiment, and wise as liberal; one in unison with the spirit of an age, which seeks to lessen the causes of national dissension and war; a sentiment, than which no better motto could be chosen by all nations entering upon negotiation;

and most especially suited to the United States and England, as having common interests and sympathies, perhaps beyond all others existing.

November 26. Attend the levee at Carlton House. Converse with Mr. Robinson, Mr. Vansittart, Lord Westmoreland, the Duke of Wellington, Mr. Stratford Canning, and several of the diplomatic corps. Hear nothing of our own affairs. Topics are general. The disturbed state of the country is one; the weather another; the weather—always a topic in England, because, as Johnson says, it is always uncertain; and this season especially a topic, winter having set in uncommonly soon; which as one remarks it to another, the ball of conversation thus gets its first motion. And before any one pronounces it a trifling or unapt topic, let him turn to Johnson's essay on the subject in the Idler.

November 29. Mr. Coke dines with us. He is all cordiality and good spirits. His conversation is of England, English persons and English things. He told anecdotes—some of the royal family. There was this of the late Queen: that on the evening after the duel between the Duke of York and Duke of Richmond, then Colonel Lenox, the Queen met the latter in one of the court circles and was more than usually gracious, offering her hand

as she first addressed him. He told some of the Prince Regent, who used to be his guest at Holkham, when Prince of Wales. Speaking of the nobility, he said that of the eighteen dukes in the three kingdoms, nine were on the ministerial side, and nine in opposition; he enumerated the latter, most of whom were his friends, and added that two of the royal dukes—the Duke of Kent and Duke of Sussex, usually voted also with the opposition. Speaking of the *taxes*, he said, that himself and others of his county whom he named, (opulent landholders,) had resolved that they would pay no more; that is, if they were taxed higher in some things, they would retrench their consumption in others, so as to keep at the point where they stood.

How Mr. Coke would have reconciled retrenchment any where, with all his munificent and long indulged hospitalities, was not for me to inquire. The Duke of Medina Celi, in Spain, once finding his expenses too great, determined on retrenchment. Calling up his butler, chamberlain, equerry, and all others, he desired to know what could be dispensed with; and upon receiving reports from all, it was ascertained that the only item which could possibly be struck from the annual expenses, consistently with the comforts and dignity of his household, was *one lamp* in the hall! Would the noble-hearted proprietor of Holkham, whom I am proud

to have called my friend, have retrenched after that fashion?

December 16. The Spanish ambassador gave a grand entertainment last night in honor of the marriage of his sovereign to a princess of Saxony. The Prince Regent; the Dukes of York, Clarence, Kent, and Gloucester; Prince Leopold; the Duke of Wellington; the members of the cabinet; the foreign ambassadors and ministers and their ladies; many of the nobility, and other persons of distinction, were there.

My carriage arrived at the door at about half-past ten, when we witnessed an unexpected scene. Inside and out the ambassador's whole domicil was illuminated. In front of it, on the wide flag pavement, was drawn up, a strong detachment of the horse-guards—their heels close upon the iron palisades, and heads facing the street. Every sword was drawn. The bright steel, the scarlet uniforms and jet black horses, were imposingly shown by a thousand lamps; and although the crowd in Portland Place seemed immense through the glasses of our carriage, all was silence. As we got out, not a word was heard from the assembled mass. All seemed gazing at the ambassador's domicil blazing with light, and the array of cavalry under its windows. The scene was inexplicable until we entered. I then learned, that

the government, having been warned of a probable disturbance, owing to the high names which it was supposed this fête would bring together, had called out these horse-guards.

All was tranquillity inside. The banquet was sumptuous. Amidst the train of servants were two called running footmen, in livery different from the rest, and wearing plumes. One stood behind the Prince Regent's chair, the other behind that of the Duchess of San Carlos. Besides other arrangements which the ambassador had made for the pleasure of his guests, there was one as precautionary against accident; he had caused fire engines, and a supply of firemen, to be stationed close at hand in case of fire, so profuse were the lights inside and out of the mansion.

The Prince Regent went away before the general company. None go while he remains—this would not be in proper form; and it was observed that a party of the horse-guards attended him to Carlton House, as his carriage drove off.

December 20. In my dispatch of this date to the Secretary of State, I mention that a bill has been brought into the House of Commons for continuing the duty on tobacco, snuff, and hops, for the ensuing year. Hops are charged with a specific duty on importation from foreign countries, of five pounds

eight shillings sterling the hundred weight. This amounts to a prohibition of our hops, as Mr. Hanbury told me, unless in years when the English crop fails, or is short. There is no duty, strictly speaking, on the *importation* of tobacco; but when delivered for home consumption in England from a ship arriving from foreign ports, it is immediately subject to an excise, many hundred per cent. above the original cost of the article; which bears hard upon it, as one of the productions of our old southern states, and some of our new states.

December 22. Dined at Mr. Colquhoun's, St. James's street, author of the "Power and Resources of the British Empire," "Police of London," and other works. Of the company, were Major General Wittingham, the newly appointed governor of Dominica, with some West India proprietors, and other gentlemen, and the son of Mr. Colquhoun, Consul General from the Hanseatic republic. We had much conversation; and the table displayed honorable tokens of merit, in silver vases and other ornamental articles, presents from the Senate of Hamburgh, the Island of St. Vincents, and other communities, to the elder Mr. Colquhoun, for faithful services rendered in the management of their affairs, private or political, in the course of a long and active life in London. For wines, we had them of quality and variety to suit all.

There was old hock, a present from the Senate of Hamburg; and claret was produced, that had been seven years under water. It was in an outward bound Indiaman, going as part of a stock to the Marquis of Wellesley, when Governor General of India. The vessel being wrecked, the wine was brought up by a diving machine, after that lapse of time. Being in bottles well corked, it remained sound, and, in the opinion of the table, had not lost its flavor. All agreed, that its original destination was a fair pledge of its good quality when shipped.

> "Bacchus and fostering Ceres, powers divine,
> Who gave us corn for mast, for water wine!"

Than the classic statesman for whom this wine was first intended, none could better have parodied this tribute to Bacchus, by chaunting in verse how delicious it was, even from its watery bed!

During the evening, the conversation turned on West India interests; in which, under appeals to me, I participated as far as I justly might. There was a desire to learn from me the state of the negotiations between the United States and England, under this head. I stated, in a word, the views of the former, as disclosed in the negotiations of last year, the result having been published at Washington; but did not speak of the recent communications I had made to Lord Castlereagh, and received from him.

1820. *January* 13. Had an interview with Lord Castlereagh, at my request; the object, in part, being to determine upon an umpire, under the first article of the treaty of Ghent. As the United States construed the article, it threw an obligation upon England to make compensation for all slaves, the property of their citizens, who, at the date of the ratification, were in any territory or places directed by the treaty to be restored, but were then still occupied by the British, whether the slaves were on shore at that date, or on board of British vessels lying within our waters.

England objected to so broad a construction, alleging that she was absolved from making compensation for any of the slaves who at that date had been transferred from our territory to her ships of war, still lying within our waters.

And now, at this interview with Lord Castlereagh, I proposed the Emperor of Russia as the umpire, under the provisions upon this subject in the fifth article of the convention of October, 1818. He replied that he would lay my proposals before the Prince Regent, and furnish me with an answer at as early a day as was in his power.

I next broached the subject of the interference on the part of the British authorities in Upper Canada, with the Indians residing within our territory, stating in general terms the extent and injurious

consequences of it. I said that my government had no belief that a proceeding so unfriendly had its foundation in any act or intentions of His Majesty's government; but that harmony would be best promoted through its suppression by His Majesty's government. I told his lordship that I would, at an early day, put into his hands documents on this subject, showing how the facts were. He promised that all proper attention should be paid to it.

I also read to him the copy of a letter from the Navy Department written by order of the President to Commodore Stewart, commander of our squadron in the Mediterranean, on the subject of the duels between certain officers of the sloop of war Erie, belonging to the squadron, and certain British officers of the 64th regiment, belonging to the garrison at Gibraltar. The letter conveyed the President's disapprobation of such practices, with the expression of his hopes that they would not be repeated, and that all causes of them might be avoided.

These matters disposed of, I referred incidentally to the President's message to Congress at the opening of the session last month, remarking to him, "You see that the government of the United States is for acting upon the principles of an English court of equity—good authority we hope; it is for carrying our agreement with Spain into specific execution." "So I perceive," he replied,

"but do you consider it a part of national law, that, if one party refuse to ratify a treaty, even admitting no departure from instructions by the minister negotiating it, the other party may go on to act as if the provisions were in full force?" I said no, and that no such principle was asserted, or, as I apprehended, implied in the message; the measure had been taken on a basis of its own, and was thought to be justifiable by the long and injurious delays practised by Spain in regard to all the matters in dispute; delays which we believed the whole world, when well informed of them, would admit to have been unjust. He barely rejoined, that he supposed our explanation would be to that effect.

January 17. The weather for upwards of a month, has been very cold. The thermometer has been nearly all the time from fifteen to twenty-five degrees below the freezing point. The Thames is frozen over. In the neighborhood of Kew bridge, the ice is stated to be eighteen inches thick, and in some places near Woolwich, a great deal thicker. Snow has fallen in great quantities. The papers contain accounts of persons having been frozen to death in different parts of the country, and of great suffering among the poor from the severity of the weather.

January 20. I addressed a note to Lord Castle-

reagh on the 15th instant, requesting an interview for the purpose of putting into his hands a copy of the papers which make known the interference on the part of the British colonial authorities in Upper Canada, with the Indians within our limits. His lordship being out of town, I was invited to-day to the Foreign Office by Mr. Planta, as representing him.

He acknowledged on behalf of Lord Castlereagh the receipt of my note, and said that his lordship would appoint a time for seeing me as soon as he returned to town. He then made the following communications under instructions from Lord Castlereagh.

He said that his lordship had taken the commands of the Prince Regent as to the umpire on the point in controversy respecting the slaves carried away under the treaty of Ghent, and that His Royal Highness assented to the President's desire that the true construction of the treaty in this particular should be referred to the decision of the Emperor of Russia. Lord Castlereagh being desirous that I should be informed without loss of time of this assent, would not leave town without causing it to be thus imparted to me; and Mr. Planta added, that as soon as his lordship returned, he would suggest such official steps as it appeared to the British government proper for both governments to adopt with a view to give effect to their mutual desire.

The other communication which Mr. Planta made to me was embraced in a dispatch received by Lord Bathurst as Secretary of the Colonial Department, from the governor of New Providence. This paper he read to me at the instance of Lord Castlereagh. It bore date, Nassau, September the 30th, 1819, and informed Lord Bathurst, that the Seminole king, Kenadjie, had arrived at that island, with six Indian chiefs and seventeen attendants; that all these Indians had merit in the eyes of Great Britain from having been useful to the British during the attack upon New Orleans, and that they claimed the countenance and support of the governor, as representing the British government in that quarter; nevertheless the governor replied, that he would not interfere in any way in their behalf during a state of peace with the United States, and sent them home again with no other relief than that which humanity prescribed to their immediate and pressing wants.

I thanked Mr. Planta for the communications, begging him to assure Lord Castlereagh that I would promptly make known both to my government, as I accordingly did. I also in due time apprized Mr. Campbell, Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States at St. Petersburgh, of the assent of the British government to the Emperor Alexander, as umpire; and I gave the same information to Mr. Gallatin at Paris.

CHAPTER XIV.

DEATH OF THE DUKE OF KENT. DEATH OF GEORGE THE THIRD. SOLEMNITIES AND CEREMONIES CONNECTED WITH THE DEMISE OF THE CROWN. THE PRINCE REGENT ASCENDS THE THRONE. DISSOLUTION OF PARLIAMENT DETERMINED UPON. STATE OF THINGS BETWEEN THE KING AND PRINCESS OF WALES. INTERVIEW WITH LORD CASTLEREAGH—CATO STREET CONSPIRACY. DINNER AT THE TRAVELLER'S CLUB. DINNER AT MR. STRATFORD CANNING'S. MEASURES OF PARLIAMENT UNDER THE DISURBED STATE OF THE COUNTRY. DINNER AT SIR EDWARD ANTROBUS'S; AT MR. HOLLAND'S.

January 28. On the 23d of this month, died at Sidmouth, in Devonshire, the Duke of Kent, fourth son of the King, in the fifty-third year of his age. A character of him in the Times of a few days ago, enumerates among topics of eulogy, that he was "a kind master, and a punctual and courteous correspondent." Referring to his rigor as a disciplinarian, even to things most minute, while in military com-

mand, the same article has the following remarks: "His attention to the appearance and discipline of his regiment, was unremitting; but as he could not inspire all the military world with an equal sense of the solid value of those dry details, which ought to employ so large a portion of military life, or with an equal taste for those minutiæ of the service, of which nevertheless, when considered in the aggregate, the correct performance adds so much to the precision and efficacy of military tactics, he was, for some time, an unpopular commander. Every military man is not capable of discovering, in the best conceived order, or wisest rule laid down for his observation by superior authority, the direct relation of the means to the end. It may not be thought, at first, of serious importance that an officer's coat or sword belt, should be of a specific fashion or color; but let us consider that the excellence of an army consists in its susceptibility of collective and uniform impulses, and we must admit that uniformity in smaller things—in hourly occupations and objects of attention—nay in the form of hats, or a boot, may contribute to enforce upon common minds, the main principle of harmony in action."

The Grecian Phalanx, the Roman Legion and the army of Frederick, sustain the spirit of these condensed and well expressed remarks.

January 31. On the evening of the 29th instant, the King died at Windsor Castle, in the eighty-second year of his age. This event was announced to the Foreign Ministers by a note from the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, yesterday. The following is a copy of the one I received:

"It is with the deepest concern that Viscount Castlereagh, one of his late Majesty's principal Secretaries for Foreign Affairs, has the honor to acquaint Mr. Rush, that it has pleased Almighty God to take unto himself, his late most gracious and excellent Majesty, George the Third. His Majesty expired at the Castle at Windsor, yesterday evening at thirty-five minutes past eight o'clock, to the great affliction of all the Royal Family, and of all classes of His Majesty's subjects. Viscount Castlereagh is persuaded that Mr. Rush will participate in the general grief which this melancholy event has occasioned, and requests that he will accept the assurances of his high consideration.

"FOREIGN OFFICE, *January* 30, 1820."

The King's long reign of sixty years, made the earlier parts of it historical to the generation which now witnessed his death. This was the case with all Americans born at the close of the American revolution, and was my case. To this English monarch's well known remark on receiving the first

minister from the United States, (Mr. Adams,) viz. that as he had been the "last man in his kingdom to consent to our Independence, so he would be the last, now that it was established, to call it in question," I can add another anecdote, derived from an authentic source. Mr. West, the painter, whose patron and friend the King was, being with him during the American war on an occasion when news came of a victory over the Americans, the King gave expression to his feelings. Observing Mr. West to remain silent, while all was gladness in the palace, he remarked, "Why so silent Mr. West—why not rejoice?" The latter replied, "I hope that your Majesty will not take it amiss if I cannot feel pleasure in hearing of misfortunes to those amongst whom I was born, and passed my early days." "Right, right, West—a good sentiment—I honor you for it," was the King's reply.

These anecdotes might have been sufficient, had there not been other duties prompting to it, to secure a respectful answer to Lord Castlereagh's note, responding to the forms of his own. I, according, sent one of that kind. The venerable age of this King, and the affliction with which he was visited during so many of the latter years of his life, made him largely an object of sympathy with all classes in England. He seems to have outlived political animosity, and to have closed his long and eventful

reign amidst the general good will of his people; a feeling, extended and strengthened by the purity of his private life.

Besides the foregoing note from Lord Castlereagh, there came enclosed to me, by his lordship, a copy of the London Gazette, extraordinary, of the 30th of January, containing a letter from the Duke of York, dated at Windsor, to Lord Sidmouth, Home Secretary, announcing the King's death as soon as it happened, and enclosing the statement of his physicians. A copy of the Gazette of the 31st was also sent to me, mentioning, that, on the information of the King's death reaching London, the lords, spiritual and temporal, and those of the privy council, and other persons named, assembled at Carlton House, and duly published and proclaimed George IV., late Prince of Wales, as lawful King of the realm; and that the same authority had given orders, for proclaiming him in proper form. The Gazette further contained the declaration of the new King to the people of the realm; in which, amongst other things, he pledges himself to use his endeavors to promote their happiness and prosperity, and to maintain, unimpaired, the religion, laws, and liberties of the country.

February 1. Yesterday the new King was proclaimed in due ceremony, with processions, civil,

military, and heraldic, in different parts of the metropolis. First, in front of his own palace, Carlton House; next, near King Charles's statue, Charing Cross; next, in the city, Fleet street, after some strange old forms, at Temple Bar, between the local authorities of the city and the herald king at arms, on the part of the King, before the gates were thrown open to the King; and finally at the Royal Exchange. The Park and Tower guns were firing all the while, and trumpets sounding, and divers other manifestations of joy going on; all which, to a republican of another hemisphere, might have seemed in contrast with the tolling of the great bell of St. Paul's for the death of George III., the solemn sounds of which were still in the public ear.

The foregoing ceremonial would have taken place the day after the death of the late King, but that the thirtieth of January is still observed under an act of Parliament as a solemn fast day, being the anniversary of the execution of Charles I, and church service is prescribed for the day; so that the joyous ceremonial was deferred until yesterday.

The cabinet ministers of the late King resigned their appointments on the morning after his death, into the hands of the Home Secretary, Lord Sidmouth; when the new Sovereign immediately reappointed them all.

The letters of credence of all the foreign minis-

ters, being in form to the late King, though the present King, as Prince Regent, administered the government in his name, the death of the former vacated these also; but Lord Castlereagh gave an intimation that it was the desire of the new King that they should all be considered as in full force and virtue, until the respective governments of the foreign ministers were heard from.

February 2. I receive from the office of the Lord Chamberlain, the following paper relative to a court mourning. A similar one was sent to all the ambassadors and ministers: I copy it word for word.

"Orders for the Court's going into mourning on Thursday next, the 3d instant, for our late most gracious sovereign, King George the Third, of blessed memory, viz.; the Ladies to wear black bombazines; plain muslin or long linen, crape hoods; shamois shoes and gloves, and crape fans. UNDRESS—dark Norwich crape.

"The Gentlemen to wear black cloth, without buttons on the sleeves and pockets; plain muslin or long-lawn cravats and weepers; shamois shoes and gloves, crape hat-bands, and black swords and buckles. UNDRESS—dark grey frocks."

I had received a few days before, the orders for a court mourning in terms somewhat similar, for the Duke of Kent.

These are forms incidentally set down here not for comment, but as things existing in great nations. They may thence arrest a momentary attention. Motives may be perceived why the foreign ministers residing at the English court, and in amicable intercourse with the circles composing it, would incline to fall in with the external symbols of mourning, when called upon officially to do so, even to the extent of Hamlet's description of them all, should the court itself choose to adopt them, at the decease of a revered monarch of their own, and a well-loved member of their own royal family; more especially when both were lying dead at the same time. Conformity in these things, belongs to the class of sympathies embraced in the autograph letters of President Monroe, which I have inserted in this work; and republics not inclining to conform, should keep their ministers at home. It might not be as generally imagined, that, within the compass of a few brief years, the same foreign ministers and their wives in London, were officially called upon to appear in the habiliments of grief for a king of Sweden; a grand duke of Tuscany; the king of Spain's mother; the king of Saxony's aunt; a princess of Saxe Hilbourghausen; a prince of Conde; a king of Sardinia; and for a long list in addition, as European royalty, direct, collateral and remote, from time to time, passed to the tomb. But so it was.

February 5. The new King has been very ill since his accession. All the diplomatic corps have made inquiries at Carlton Palace daily for the last three or four days. The carriages of the nobility have also thronged his residence. The answers to inquiries to-day were, that he was better.

February 10. At an informal assemblage of some of the diplomatic corps at the Saxon minister's, it was agreed that their servants, more especially their coachmen and footmen, should all be put in black for the late King. It was understood that the members of the corps not present, would all concur. The venerable Saxon minister remarked, that as it would be "an extra expense, of course, our *courts* would make a suitable allowance for it!" The American minister, who was at the meeting, made no objection to the step, and put his servants in black accordingly; but as to his "court," at Washington, it is certain that he never brought forward any such item of expense against it.

February 11. I transmit to the department of State, the report and appendix laid before Parliament on the subject of weights and measures. Also information and communications from Sir Joseph Banks on this subject, with which he obligingly furnished me; Sir Joseph (the President of the Royal

Society) having been placed by the Prince Regent last year at the head of a commission in relation to the subject. The ancient models of weights and measures deposited in the English Exchequer, at Guildhall, and other places, having, by lapse of time and other causes, varied from each other, so as to render perfect accuracy unattainable, the object of the commission was, to seek the right modes of rendering them accurate, and preserving them so. I send also to the Department, various books; among them, Hansard's Parliamentary History, and Parliamentary Debates, and Pickering's edition of the Statutes at large; all this, under the instructions of Mr. Adams, who is engaged, as Secretary of State, in preparing, by order of Congress, a report on weights and measures.

February 16. This day the funeral of George III. took place at Windsor. The shops in London were all shut, the streets deserted, and the tolling of the great bell of St. Paul's was heard at intervals throughout the whole day. I pass over the description of the funeral solemnities, given in all the chronicles of the day.

What a reign has been this monarch's! The publications of the last fortnight, have teemed with notices of it; of the mighty scenes and revolutions which it has witnessed in both hemispheres; the

strife of arms throughout the world, with which it has been identified; the dominion lost and gained to Britain during its long term; the stupendous results thence flowing and to flow, to mankind; and the revolutions in science and other things, which it has also witnessed! These things, and much more, the press has been recalling. History will take accouut of them all. But that which was most calculated to occupy the thoughts of an American minister when George III. died, was the fact, that his own country had been politically born, after this reign commenced, as well as the recollection of its astonishing increase, and increase of Britain also, whilst the same monarch still sat upon the throne; an increase in resources and power, far transcending that of any other two nations of the globe during the same period. The increase of both in population, throwing into the scale the colonial and oriental subjects of Britain, seems to stagger belief. Their aggregate increase, in all ways, has given earnest that Britain and the United States are destined to become, to an extent not easy to estimate, the predominating nations of Christendom; as already their joint commerce and tonnage, those fruitful causes and sure evidences of power in modern times, overmatch that of all Christendom. The demonstrations are in steady progress, and the death of George III. naturally recalls them, that the Anglo-Saxon

race is to rule in the western hemisphere, as the spirit of the same race rules in Asia. From east to west, the language, laws, commerce and freedom of that great race, are extending with resistless force, and must overspread, in primary activity and in civilizing power and influence, the face of the globe. If any thing could add to the force of such thoughts, crowding into the mind of a citizen of the United States officially witnessing the close of the reign of George III. in his own kingdom, and called upon to join in the external badges of mourning at the termination of his mortal career, it would be a recollection of the predictions at the close of the American Revolution, made by master minds in both hemispheres, not only that the scheme of popular government in the United States would fail, but that the downfall of Britain would also date from that memorable dismemberment of her own empire. Short-sighted predictions! Each country an incumbrance to the other when together, their severance seems to have been the signal of unequalled progress, and boundless prospects, to each; not more in material dominion, than in the solid and durable glory of widening the empire of rational freedom throughout the world.

February 19. It has been determined that Parliament is to be dissolved, instead of waiting for the

period when it would expire by law. This period is six months from the demise of the crown. The opposition strongly object to this course, saying that it covers an intention in the ministry to set out with some high-handed acts of taxation or power under the new reign, which a parliament on the eve of responsibility to the people, would be reluctant to adopt. The ministers reply, that they advise a dissolution for the public convenience, as time might fail them if they attempted to go through all the business which the first session of the new reign will call for, if restricted to the six months; and also that they advise it for the sake of avoiding those drawbacks to business in the House of Commons, and agitations to the country, always incident more or less to a general election in England.

Beyond this, I hear, through a good source, that ministers are uneasy at the state of things between the King and Princess of Wales, now become Queen. As Queen consort in the eye of the law, she also succeeds to the rights and dignities of the station. The King is known to be opposed to her being invested with these, and is understood to desire a divorce. His constitutional advisers reply, that in no part of her conduct that has yet come to light, do they discover a sufficient warrant for prosecuting adversely such a measure against her. So matters are said to rest at present, the new Queen being still out of the Realm.

I even hear, through another source, that the ministers are prepared to withdraw from their posts rather than depart from the opinion which their duty has pointed out to them, perceiving no alternative course in any lights which they can yet command; and that this their determination has been made known to the King, who, for the present, submits himself to their guidance. It is thus that I write to my government on the state of things since the demise of the crown.

"*February* 24. Going to Lord Castlereagh's at eleven this morning by appointment, the servant at the door informed me that he was not up. I expressed a hope that he was not unwell. The servant replied that he did not know; on which I handed him my card, telling him to give it to Lord Castlereagh, and say that I had called according to appointment. The servant immediately requested me to walk into the reception room, while he went up stairs with my card. He returned with a request from his lordship that I would go up to his chamber; on which I said that I should be most unwilling to disturb him if unwell. "My Lord's desire is to see you, Sir," was his reply. I accordingly went up. Here I found him sitting before the fire on a sofa in his flannel gown. With his wonted courtesy, he apologized for giving me the trouble of coming up stairs; to which I answered how happy I was to do

so, unless I found him unwell, in which case I would not say a word on business but have the honor of calling some other time. He said no, he was quite well, but fatigued from being kept up till nearly daylight through a cause he would mention, but requested I would first proceed to the object of our interview, which he had not forgotten, and desired to hear from me the disclosures I had to lay before him.

My call related to a subject I had broached last month, further attention to which had been suspended by the King's death; viz. interference by the British authorities in Canada, with the Indians living within the boundaries of the United States; and I now handed him the documents which went to show the facts. It appeared from the documents that an extraordinary number of the Indians within our limits, chiefly those inhabiting the region between Detroit and the Mississippi, had repaired by invitation during the last season to Malden, where supplies in great amount and variety, but chiefly arms, ammunition and clothing, had been dealt out to them by the British authorities at that Canadian town and fort. That the number thus receiving supplies, was thought to have exceeded all former example during any one year of peace or war hitherto, and had probably been little short of three thousand; that the supplies had been in the nature of pure gifts, no

equivalent appearing to have passed from the Indians in land sold, or services rendered; that their journeys to and fro, were fraught with inconvenience and danger to the inhabitants of the United States dwelling within the region through which they passed, their property being trespassed upon and their quiet invaded, by their irregular, riotous, and often nocturnal marches; that they travelled in gangs large enough to intimidate, and, as the natural effect of the presents they received at Malden, and perhaps of counsels given to them by the ill disposed, uniformly returned through the United States territory with growing indications of ill will towards our people. That my Government had no belief that such proceedings were, or could be, countenanced by His Majesty's Government, or known to it; but long experience of the past, had admonished us of the fatal consequences of this kind of intercourse with the Indians within our limits. That it was sure to sow the seeds of hostility in their minds, and, sooner or later, bring on murder and plunder, and often wide-spread desolation, to our frontier inhabitants; the final result of which was, when the United States were compelled to call out a force, the destruction of the Indians, whom it was never their wish to see destroyed, but to let them live in peace and contentment. That it was in vain that we excluded British traders from the Indians within our

limits, if multitudes of our Indians were invited to British depots in Canada to be supplied with all they wanted; since it was obvious that such practices were far worse for us than if a solitary British trader, here and there, stationed himself within our line, and engaged in traffick with our Indians. That, in fine, the conduct complained of, looked like systematically attracting formidable bodies of them from our territory, for no other purpose than to receive annual subsidies, and train their passions for future and fatal mischief.

The documents which I put into Lord Castlereagh's hands, consisted of communications from Governor Cass, Governor of the Territory of Michigan, and residing in Detroit, to the Secretary of War, covering a great body of written evidence to substantiate the above facts. I concluded, with an earnest request in the President's name, that His Majesty's Government would issue the proper orders to the colonial authorities or agents in Canada, for putting a stop to the practices complained of, reminding his lordship of the strong title which the United States had to ask such interposition, from having invariably on their part forborne to entertain intercourse with the Indians living within the limits of British possessions, any where along the line dividing the territories of the two nations.

He replied, that the subject was new to him, until

I had opened it last month; that he would carefully read the documents I had handed him, and then submit them to Lord Bathurst, to whose official province the subject primarily belonged; after which I might feel assured that such a course would be taken by his Majesty's government, as the nature of the complaint appeared justly to call for.

The subject was now gone through. I will own that I was not without curiosity to learn how it had come to pass, that I was called upon to explain it in his lordship's chamber; and now my curiosity was to be satisfied. He proceeded, with all calmness, to let me know the cause, and I had from him the following narrative:

He said, that he and his colleagues of the administration had been kept up all night, and almost until dawn, by the affair of Thistlewood's conspiracy, Thistlewood and his accomplices having been arrested, and the plot crushed, only since the preceding night had set in. This man, he said, with others, had formed a plot for murdering the whole of the ministers, the perpetration of which was to have been effected last evening; and, daring as it might appear, effected in the *dining-room* of Lord Harrowby, where it was known the members of the cabinet were all to have dined yesterday. They did not go to the dinner, as intended, one of the conspirators having warned Lord Harrowby of the danger, though only yesterday, while

he was riding on horseback in the Park. Lord Harrowby gave no countermand to his butler respecting the dinner, but suffered the arrangements to go on as if nothing had happened, until between seven and eight o'clock in the evening. Twelve members of the cabinet would have dined there, but for the warning. They assembled elsewhere; and a little before the time when, according to the warning, the conspirators were to have issued from their rendezvous, caused a force, civil and military, to be sent to the spot designated. This was a stable, which you entered through an arch-way, in an obscure street, called Cato street, near the Edgeware road, about two miles from Grosvenor Square, where Lord Harrowby resided; and in the loft of that stable, sure enough, the conspirators were found, fully armed, and ready to sally forth on their work of blood at the hour agreed upon. Fifteen or twenty were congregated. On a demand to surrender, they resisted fiercely, and the civil officers being in advance, one of the latter was killed, others wounded, and all would probaby have been overcome, but for the arrival of the military. The military coming up, led by Captain Fitzclarence, succeeded in capturing about one half; the remainder escaped, after fighting their way as well as they could. The arms found upon them, and in the place where they were captured, consisted of pistols, swords, daggers, and hand-

grenades, the latter formed in a way to produce great destruction if thrown into a room.

This, in effect, was the account I had from his lordship. It fixed my attention, and I heartily congratulated him on his escape, and the escape of his colleagues, from so barbarous a plot. Our conversation was prolonged on some of its incidents as far as yet brought to light, and on the supposed inducements to so bloody-minded a crime. Lord Castlereagh's conjectures were, that, by murdering all the ministers in a single night, the conspirators possibly imagined they could overturn the government; or, perhaps, thought it more likely, that, by taking advantage of the first moments of consternation and tumult which would have followed the deed, they might have brought about scenes of temporary plunder and desolation in London, and then escape loaded with booty, before the law could overtake them.

Before coming away after this unusual interview, he asked me if I had seen General Vives, the new minister from Madrid to the United States, then in London, on his route to Washington. I said that I had not. He replied that he had, and that he had not failed to say to him every thing of a healing nature as between the United States and Spain, adding, that he continued to look to an accommodation of all the differences with the same wishes as formerly.

Februarg 27. Dined at the Traveller's Club. We had Mr. Bagot, Mr. Stratford Canning, Lord Dartmouth, Mr. Planta, Sir Edmund Antrobus, Mr. McKensie, Mr. Chad, Count Ludolf, and others.

Conversation was various, the Cato street conspiracy not being forgotten. All seemed to believe in its verity, of which the circumstances already disclosed hardly leave a doubt; the men being found at the place pointed out by their accomplice; their being armed; their fierce resistance until the military arrived, and then their flight, all pointing to a guilty purpose; to which effect was the conversation.

Talking with Count Ludolf before we sat down, he mentioned the following anecdote of Louis XVIII. When the news of the late assassination of the Duke de Berri was brought to him, he was in bed. He immediately rose, but before he would repair to the scene, ordered one of his state dresses to be brought, which he put on, and afterwards waited for his barber; saying that it was not proper for a King of France to appear otherwise before his subjects. He made it three quarters of an hour before he could get off. The Duke was not quite dead when the King arrived, but every moment was expected to be his last!!

The company rose from table at about ten, when most of us went to Lady Castlereagh's, where

a party was beginning to assemble. Several of the ministers were at it, the Duke of Wellington among the number. The conspiracy appeared to be the topic first spoken of by all, ladies as well as gentlemen; and the ministers were congratulated by those who had not seen them before, on their escape.

March 3. Dined at Mr. Stratford Canning's, great Cumberland street. Of the guests were Mr. Bagot, Mr. Planta, Sir Edmund Antrobus, Mr. Inglis, Count Ludolf, and Mr. J. Adams Smith.

The clubs of London were spoken of, particularly some of the older ones; as White's, Brooks's, the Arthur, Boodles, the Cocoa-tree, and the Thatched House. White's, the Tory Club, established in the time of Charles II, consisted of five hundred members, and there was said to be considerable difficulty in getting admission, as it was generally full. The place of head waiter at this club, was said to be worth five hundred guineas a year. Brooks's, the Whig club, was not so numerous; it consisted of four hundred members. Boodles was chiefly for independent country gentlemen, and was stated to exceed both the others in comfort. Things were mentioned of some of these clubs, and others more modern and costly in their establishment, showing the large moneyed resources which they have at command, and the excellent accommodation thence seen

in their arrangements, including libraries, maps, and other intellectual appliances.*

Incidents of the Cato street conspiracy came before us; and we had plenty of conversation on other subjects, intermingled with anecdote. One which our host told, I must venture upon repeating, though I shall not be able to give it with the point he did. It related to Lord Byron, and was only one of several which were told of him. His lordship happened to be at Constantinople in 1810 or '11, when some grand procession was on foot, he, Mr. Canning, then being Secretary of the British Embassy in that capital. His lordship inclining, rather perhaps as British peer than poet, to take part in the procession, applied to the Secretary of the Embassy to know where his place would be, with an intimation that he supposed his rank in England would not be overlooked. The Secretary naturally referred him to the Ambassador on a point that might not under all the circumstances, be of very easy adjustment. The Ambassador was embarrassed between a

* Having spoken of the London Clubs in a former chapter, I will here remark, that the Secretaries of the Diplomatic Corps, and other young attachés, had the privilege of frequenting them, as well as Ambassadors and Ministers, and thus had every opportunity of deriving advantage from the improving intercourse to which they opened a door. My son, who was Secretary of Legation when Mr. Stevenson was Minister, had the privilege of visiting the Traveller's Club, and others, obtained for him through the Minister's kind instrumentality; and he greatly felt his obligations to the Committee of these Clubs.

real desire to oblige his lordship, and the real difficulty of placing him where the noble poet himself might have imagined he ought to be. At length the day arrived, and Byron made his appearance with his broad cock'd hat on, and otherwise ceremoniously equipped. He stood waiting to have his place assigned, not doubting but that he would move with the Embassy, and perhaps have a conspicuous place in it. This was found impossible, under official arrangements common to all the Embassies, and his lordship had to follow behind, and make out as well as he could. When it was all over, the Ambassador, still anxious to smooth matters, wrote him a courteous note, explanatory of his inability to procure him any other place; letting drop the idea also, that his lordship had given rank to whatever place he had. In reply, Byron sent a note of equal courtesy, saying that he had no complaint whatever to make, and withal assuring the Ambassador that he would ever be happy on such occasions to walk after him, "*his ox, his ass, or any thing that was his.*"

With such anecdotes was the evening enlivened. It had the charm of small dinner parties in England, where all the arrangements seem to combine to give to this form of social assemblage chosen facilities for conversation; before the attractions of which, the ancient worship of the bottle has taken a very secondary place.

March 7. Parliament was dissolved the last of February, not by the new King in person, but by commissioners, and the work of electing a new House of Commons has already been actively commenced.

The assassination plot has continued to be a prevailing topic in all circles since its discovery and suppression. It has caused great excitement, it may almost be said some dismay, so foul was its nature, and so near did it appear to have advanced to success. Thanks were offered up at the Royal Chapel, St. James's, for the escape of those whose lives were threatened. Different uses are made of the event according to the different opinions and feelings of the people in a country where the press speaks what it thinks, and no tongue is tied. The supporters of government say that it was the offspring of a profligate state of morals among the lower orders, produced by publications emanating from what they called the "cheap press," which the late measures of Parliament aimed at putting down; and added, that it vindicated the necessity and wisdom of those measures. The opponents of government who vehemently resisted the measures, insisted in reply, that it was wrong to suppress, or even attempt to interfere with, such publications, since, if irritated feeling, however unjust might be deemed its causes, were not allowed vent in that way, it would find

modes more dangerous; and that although a check might perhaps be given to the "cheap press," other presses in England would hold whatever language they pleased against the government.

Even in a debate in the House of Lords, three days after the event, Earl Grosvenor, a nobleman deeply interested by his great possessions in seeing the public tranquillity maintained, declared that there would not be wanting persons who would regard it as "the offspring of an erroneous system of coercion;" but afterwards, fearing that what had fallen from him, might possibly be misconstrued into an intended mitigation of the crime, he explained away the force of his remark.

The measures of Parliament alluded to, were matured in the early part of the session, and I made a report of them to my government in the early part of January. They aimed at abridging first, the circulation of cheap publications; second, the freedom of public meetings; and, thirdly, they invested magistrates with certain powers to disarm the people, to a limited extent, by clothing them with authority to search suspected places for arms. The measures were not designed to be permanent, and have since, I believe, been superseded in most of their provisions, or passed away altogether; but as showing the state of the times, I will introduce from my report, some of the forebodings that were uttered.

In the House of Peers, Lord Sidmouth, in defending the measures, said, that "the constitution of England was in *greater* danger than it had been at any time since the accession of the House of Brunswick to the throne."

Lord Grenville said, that "nothing could *equal* the imminence of the peril which impended over the country."

Earl Grey, in opposition, thus expressed himself: he declared, that the measures "took away the protection allowed to free discussion, and aimed a blow at one of the most valuable rights of Englishmen, such as *the most arbitrary minister, in the most arbitrary* times, never proposed to Parliament."

In the House of Commons, Mr. Plunkett said, that, "in the present state of the country, the slightest cause might be sufficient *to unsheath the sword of civil discord.*"

And Mr. Tierney exclaimed, with all animation, "I can see on the part of government a determination to resort to *nothing* but *force;* they think of nothing else; they *dream* of nothing else; they will make no attempt to pacify; *force, force,* nothing but *force*—that is their cry."

Thus much for Parliament. Turning to out-door indications, I take the following, as only a single specimen; and as by no means a fair specimen of the *violence* of language used, because I select it on

account of the high names it presents. On the 24th of January, a very large meeting of whigs was held at Norwich to celebrate the birthday of Charles James Fox, the great whig statesman and parliamentary orator, during and before the French revolution. Amongst those present, were the Duke of Norfolk, premier peer of England, the Duke of Sussex, and Mr. Coke, of Holkham. One of the avowed objects of the meeting was, to mix, with the anniversary celebration, a denunciation of the measures of Parliament. Mr. Coke called them "*bills of blood;*" and the Duke of Sussex, denounced them in very explicit and animated terms, saying among other things, that they were "violent, unnecessary, and *unconstitutional.*" He also invoked the opinions of the Duke of Kent, which he affirmed to be the same as his own. It is remarkable that the Duke of Kent was then lying a corpse in another part of the kingdom, though this, of course, was unknown to his royal brother.

It may, perhaps, be new to many of the present generation, that such accumulated and portentous dangers existed in England, in 1820. The opinions and assertions, from sources so high, and which no doubt were sincerely uttered at the time, of the reality of their existence, may serve to show of how little account such forebodings generally are in that country, when a few years so generally put them to

flight. The certainty of her advancing prosperity might almost, it would seem, be assumed, from assertions and predictions coming from herself, to the contrary; since the absence of these might foreshadow, that the active spirit of her people was abating, under enervating influences creeping upon her to stifle the boldness of speech inherent in her freedom; and always sure to break out in complaints of her condition, and accusations against her rulers. Similar complaints and accusations must ever have existence, to a greater or less extent, in all free and great nations during their onward progress in resources and power. They are witnessed in the United States. Such onward progress, cannot but be attended by vicissitudes, affording to the restless a large field, and even to the intelligent and patriotic, plausible ground, on divers occasions, for inveighing against the exercise of power, and exaggerating adverse appearances.

Other nations are apt to be misled in regard to England, by this accusing, and denouncing, and often despondent voice, ever ready to be uttered, to its very largest extent, in her parliament, her press, and throughout the ranks of her people. When, three years ago, she sent her Ambassador, Lord Ashburton, to Washington, to negotiate respecting the North Eastern Boundary, it might be instructive to recall, even at this short interval, all that was

said, within her own borders at that moment, of the Chartist excitement; of the O'Connel movement; of the human misery (too real) just then discovered in her collieries; of the disasters to English arms in Affghanistan, and of her approaching war with China. From these things, all co-existent at that precise epoch, and dwelt upon with intensity of emphasis throughout great classes in her own dominions, many of our own people were inclined to infer the probability—almost certainty—that she would yield to us; yet, what was her actual course in that important negotiation, and what is her situation, at present, in reference to those sources of difficulty and darkly painted dangers? Where are they now? Making this incidental allusion to Lord Ashburton, I cannot avoid saying, what I believe Americans of all parties who knew him in Washington would be ready to say; namely, that it would be difficult to determine which was most conspicuous in him, superior intelligence of mind, with skill in affairs—or an uniformly discreet and most conciliating temper, to cooperate with the powers of his understanding, in dealing with affairs. A stranger to the existing generation among us on his first arrival, he left our shores with universal public respect; although all did not like the treaty which he, and the highly gifted negotiator on the American side, concluded. It experienced a fate common to most treaties be-

tween great nations—was inveighed against on both sides; thereby starting the inference, of there being redeeming characteristics in it for both.

March 10. Dined with Sir Edmund Antrobus. We had the Earl of Hardwicke, the Earl of Caledon, Lord Binning, Sir George Warrender, Mr. Bagot, Mr. Stratford Canning, and others.

Cobbett's name was mentioned. Lord Hardwicke spoke of the esteem in which he was held in England many years ago, particularly by Mr. Windham, and told the following anecdote. That Mr. Pitt once came up to Windham in the House of Commons, and said, "Windham, do you dine at home to-day?" "I do," said Windham. "Then," said Pitt, "I will come and dine with you." "Agreed," said Windham, "but I fear that you won't like your company, for Cobbett is to dine with me." "Never mind that," said Pitt; "as I do not take him at breakfast, (meaning that he did not take his paper,) I shall have no objections to meeting him at dinner," and accordingly went. This was during the time when Cobbett's extraordinary pen was defending the government.

March 11. Dined at Mr. Holland's, Russell Square, formerly mentioned as of the firm of Messieurs Barings. The company consisted of

Doctor Holland, Mr. Lenox of New York, Mr. Greeg, Mr. Park, and a few others.

Dr. Holland is known by his professional eminence, and as having been travelling physician to the Princess of Wales, now Queen; and not less known by the accomplishments of his mind. His conversation marks his knowledge on literary and other subjects. We had, as a topic, the authorship of Junius, no new light appearing as yet to have been shed upon the question by the death of George the Third, as was once anticipated. Dr. Holland represented the public belief as at length, in a great degree, settled down on Sir Philip Francis—the best informed men in England who had attended to the subject, were beginning to think so; and, for himself, he considered the evidence as good as it could be, this side of positive proof.

Speaking of Mr. Walsh's book on the United States and England, his opinion was, that it would do good; and so thought others, he added, with whom he was in intercourse. It would serve to spread much information new to English readers, and at least show on how many points America was misunderstood; and, from want of information, erroneously judged in England. I said that I had read the work with great interest, under hopes that it would spread useful light before both countries.

CHAPTER XV.

DINNER AT THE MARQUIS OF LANSDOWNE'S. INTERVIEW WITH EARL BATHURST ON THE SUBJECT OF PRESENTS TO THE AMERICAN INDIANS. FUNERAL OF MR. WEST, PRESIDENT OF THE ROYAL ACADEMY. DUELS BETWEEN NAVAL OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES, AND BRITISH OFFICERS AT GIBRALTAR—INTERVIEW WITH THE COLONIAL SECRETARY OF STATE ON THIS SUBJECT. DINNER AT THE MIDDLE TEMPLE WITH MR. GEORGE JOY. DINNER AT LORD HARROWBY'S; AT LORD CASTLEREAGH'S; AT MR. ROBINSON'S.

March 18. Dined at the Marquis of Lansdowne's, where we had Mr. De Neuman of the Austrian Embassy, Mr. Lamb, of the Melbourne family, and several members of Parliament.

Before going to dinner, Lord Lansdowne, referring to the late revolution in Spain, mentioned that the King had consented to accept the constitution of 1812. Such, he said, were the accounts of the day.

We were soon at table. The dinner proceeded

as all dinners in that classic dining-room, where elegant hospitalities are so often dispensed.

The courses over, and servants out of the room, the conversation grew to be general; this marking the time when it usually becomes the most completely so, at English dinners.

What subject should then come to be talked over, but the old Spanish Armada! How it got uppermost, or who introduced it, I scarcely know. It seemed to have slipped itself in by some chance—possibly from the Cato street conspiracy having produced an allusion to Babington's conspiracy. Instead of crossing our path transiently and disappearing, it got to be *the* topic, excluding others for its time. My curiosity was awakened to know what would be said. The Armada had been in my fancy since school days; I had got passages of Elizabeth's speech to her troops by heart, as thousands of American boys, probably, also had; and had settled it, as part of a boy's creed, not only that the invincible Armada was beaten, but that if the Spaniards had landed, they would have been beaten still worse on terra firma.

Not so thought the company, at least not all; opinion was divided; in fact, the preponderance was decidedly with Spain. I took no part. I left all to the English gentlemen, sufficiently taken up in listening to the topic, thus handled in the heart of Old England. Those who sided with Spain, held that

the salvation of England had turned upon the death of the Spanish Admiral, and Vice-Admiral, before the sailing of the Armada, which accounted for its disasters, the command getting into inexperienced hands; the soldiers on board would otherwise, most probably, have been landed; these, when reinforced by greater numbers from the Netherlands, all of them Spanish veterans, and joined by the Catholics of England, then secretly inflamed by the execution of Mary of Scots, and the whole led by the Duke of Parma, must have overwhelmed England; some unknown chance might have saved her—nothing short of it.

So they viewed the subject, and so they seemed to settle it. I listened with a sceptic's ears; for what would the English armies have been doing all the while? What, the descendants of men who had fought at Cressy, Poictiers, Agincourt? Such thoughts passed in my mind. There was no need of uttering them, however, for our noble host dissented. He had left the conversation very much to his guests, content with occasionally throwing in a suggestion, as it was in progress; but, in the end, he gently, and (according to my poor thoughts,) effectually, overset the whole hypothesis by asking, why England could not have resisted the Spaniards then, as well as the people of the Low Countries?

Such were some of the historical speculations of the evening. Others engaged us a little. Leland's

history of Ireland was spoken of, and the portion of Irish history written by Spencer. Of the former, Lord Lansdowne expressed favorable opinions; and the "Fairy Queen" vouched the merit of the latter.

The general election in progress, being touched upon, something curious was mentioned; namely, that at Preston, the place where Mr. Hunt, the Reformer, was a candidate, universal suffrage prevailed, no freehold or other qualification of any kind, save that of sleeping six nights in the place, being required in a voter. How this came about was not explained, or I did not catch the explanation. It was remarked upon as a curious anomaly in the English system of elections.

March 27. Had an interview with Earl Bathurst at the Colonial office, Downing street, on the subject of the presents given to our Indians by British agents in Canada. His lordship had on his table, all the papers which I had put into the hands of Lord Castlereagh, on this subject, and had been examining them.

He began the conversation by assurances of its being the desire of His Majesty's government to avoid all disturbance in that quarter to the general harmony subsisting between the two countries, and declared that it was neither under any instructions, nor wishes, emanating from the government here,

that the Indians living within our limits, had resorted to Malden last year in the numbers stated. On the contrary, it was the desire of this government that they should not repair thither, or to any of the British posts, but keep altogether within our territory. If such bands of travelling Indians were an annoyance to our people on the way, it might be supposed that their concentrated numbers when they reached Malden, must prove more highly so to the British inhabitants of that place. That this, in fact, was the case. Still less, he observed, were the views of His Majesty's government carried into effect, if, when they arrived at Malden, any incitements to hostility, or ill will of any kind against the United States, were infused into their minds by the Colonial officers or agents. Upon this point, he was willing to hope that there had been misconceptions in the accounts furnished to the Governor of the Michigan Territory, and by him transmitted to the Secretary of War. But, continued his lordship, although we do not invite the Indians to that station, and should be glad if they would not frequent it, we are not at present prepared to go the length of a positive interdiction. We will write to our proper officers in that quarter, and instruct them to use the strongest expostulations to put a stop to their visits; but should the Indians nevertheless come, we cannot at this moment say that we should feel justified in

withholding presents which we have been in the habit of distributing among all the Indians, our own as well as others, who, during a long course of time, have resorted to our posts. He here put into my hands a paper purporting to be a return, dated the thirtieth of August, 1819, to the store keeper general in London, from the store keeper's office in Quebec, containing a list of all the presents issued to Indians of every description from the Indian Department at Montreal, between the twenty-fifth of June and twenty-fourth of August, 1819, which covered the period during which it appeared by the representations submitted, that the greatest number of our Indians had assembled at Malden. He pointed to the items respecting rifles, common guns, powder and shot; and inferred from the small quantities of each dealt out, within that period, how inconsiderable must have been the share falling to our Indians, and that what they got, could only have been for the purpose of hunting. The return was an original, but he allowed me to bring it away to be copied.

I replied that I would take care that my government should be distinctly informed of all he said, remarking however, that it would form a communication of a different nature from the one which I had hoped to make. The expectation of my government undoubtedly was, that the intercourse would be wholly prohibited. It could not, I remarked, be

necessary for me to say, that to give presents to the Indians when arriving from our limits, was, in effect, to invite them; the amount of gifts bestowed in the present instance was of slight moment; it was the influence thence created, and all collateral consequences thence resulting, that we desired to avoid.

His lordship remarked, that it appeared that the Secretary of War, had, by a letter of the twenty-sixth of last August, authorised Governor Cass to adopt measures for putting a stop to the intercourse in future; and added that it would be highly agreeable to His Majesty's government if they proved successful. The immediate safety of our inhabitants, I rejoined, dictated such measures; but it must be obvious at what expense to the United States they would have to be adopted, when the Indians came to understand that we intended thus to cut them off from their presents; whereas, the presents being withheld, there would be no motive to the intercourse. I therefore felt sure, that my government would indulge the hope that the past policy of His Majesty's government in this respect, would be reconsidered and abandoned. So the subject was left for that occasion.

March 30. Yesterday I attended the funeral of Mr. West. It proceeded from Somerset House to St. Paul's, where the interment took place, and was

a public funeral by desire of the Royal Academy, of which the deceased was President. It was understood that the King's desire was the same, His Majesty being patron of the Institution. It was therefore conducted under the immediate superintendence of the Royal Academy. Between forty and fifty mourning coaches, the horses of each having covers of black velvet over them, made part of the train. There were the usual ceremonies in other respects of a funeral of this description in London; such as marshalmen and cloakmen on horseback, (the cloaks all black,) mutes, and pages. The hearse was drawn by six horses covered with black velvet; and the mourning coaches being also entirely black, as well as the horses, the harness, and all the feathers and plumes, gave a solemn air to this pomp for the dead. The effect of the whole was heightened as the corpse was slowly borne into the immense cathedral of St. Paul's, pronounced the most imposing edifice for size and grandeur, reared in Europe by Protestant hands.

Mr. West being a native of my country, I was invited by the council and officers of the Royal Academy to the funeral, as a pall-bearer, and attended in that capacity. The other pall-bearers were, the Earl of Aberdeen, Sir William Scott,* Sir George Beaumont, General Phipps, the Honorable Augustus Phipps, Sir Thomas Baring, and Sir Robert Wilson.

* Afterwards Lord Stowel.

When the body reached the choir, the bier was set down and an anthem sung. It was then conveyed to the vault door, attended by the pall-bearers and mourners, and interred next to that of Sir Joshua Reynolds, the funeral church-service being performed, at the perforated brass plate under the centre of the dome. The chief officiating clergyman, was the Reverend Gerald Valerian Wellesley, brother of the Duke of Wellington. Altogether, the scene was of much solemnity, and attested the honors paid by this distinguished Society to departed genius. Large and distinguished portions of the society of London responded to the feeling which dictated them, as was manifested by the private carriages belonging to the nobility and others, seen in the procession, which exceeded the mourning coaches in number.*

Two of the mourning coaches were appropriated to the pall-bearers. The one in which I was, conveyed also the Earl of Aberdeen, Sir William Scott, and General Phipps. The first, besides his eminence as a statesman, is distinguished by attainments in the arts; a testimonial of which is, his classical treatise on architecture prefixed to an edition of Vitruvius, written during or after his travels in Greece. The slow pace of the procession until we

* George III. allowed Mr. West a thousand pounds sterling a year, and had paid him forty thousand pounds for the encouragement of the fine arts.

arrived at the Cathedral, was favourable to quiet conversation. The crowd along the Strand, and in passing Temple Bar, was very great. The appearance of the streets served to call up historical recollections: as when Charles II. passed along the same streets thronged with multitudes, at the restoration, and when the French King was led through them, as the captive of Edward III. Sir William Scott, who recalled these things, alluded also to the famous fracas which took place in this line of street a couple of centuries ago between the retinue of the Spanish and French ambassadors, on a strugle for precedence, when the traces of the carriages of the latter were cut by the servants of the former—an incident familiar to diplomatic literature. The late revolution in Spain favorable to the constitution of 1812, being spoken of, General Phipps remarked, that it had moved along with great tranquillity. Sir William, pausing a moment, replied—AS YET. The classical brevity of this great civilian, is known; and equally, that he is not very partial to popular government. I found that both he and Lord Aberdeen had been reading Mr. Walsh's book. They said that it contained much information. Sir William asked what pursuit Mr. Walsh was engaged in. I said none, that I knew of, being, I believed, in easy circumstances. As the Cathedral came in full view, he remarked, that he understood that the edifices in

England which made most impression upon Americans, were the Gothic, as we had none in the United States; none at least that were ancient. I replied, that such was probably the case; he then remarked, that although we had no antiquities among us, we had a long race to run, which he hoped would prove fortunate. I said that we were proud of the stock we came from; on which Lord Aberdeen threw in the courteous quotation, Matre pulchrâ filia pulchrior.

As we entered the Cathedral, the procession halting a moment, Sir William, next to whom I stood, cast his eye around, and in a low voice cited the celebrated inscription which appears in it, to Sir Christopher Wren, "Si queris monumentum, circumspice." He added, that Sir Christopher was one of their greatest men, a great mathematician as well as architect, besides having various other merits.

March 31. In the course of a communication to the Secretary of State of this date, I mention two recent trials at law, which, from their connexion with public events, and public feeling, seemed to claim a passing notice. One was that of Mr. Henry Hunt, a Reformer, and popular leader of the day. He had acted as chairman of a great public meeting held near Manchester last August, to disperse which the military were called out in aid of the civil authority, and lives lost. He was tried at York

under charges of a riot and conspiracy, and for assembling an unlawful multitude with a view to stir up hatred and contempt against the constitution and government. The trial lasted nine days, was said to have been impartial, and ended in his conviction on the third charge, the jury acquitting him of the rest.

The other trial was that of Sir Francis Burdett, also a popular leader of high personal standing, a member of Parliament, and an ancient Baronet of large estate. Being at his seat in Leicestershire in August, when the news of what had happened at the Manchester meeting reached him, he addressed a letter to the electors of Westminster, whose representative he was in the House of Commons, condemning in sharp and inflammatory terms the conduct of the government. It was on some parts of this letter that the prosecution was founded; which took the shape of an ex officio information against him for a libel tending to bring the government into contempt and excite sedition. The trial was held at Leicester, his own county, and resulted in his conviction. Sir Francis conducted his own defence with his usual ability and spirit. Both defendants were punished by the court, by fine and imprisonment.

April 13. Had an interview with Lord Bathurst

at the colonial office. It related to fresh disputes between officers of our squadron in the Mediterranean, and British officers of the garrison at Gibraltar.

His lordship said that he had requested me to call for the purpose of some conversation on this subject, and especially to inform me that the order which Governor Don, the British commander in chief at the garrison, had issued, forbidding the squadron to enter the port in consequence of these disputes, had not been ratified by His Majesty's government, but on the contrary would be revoked. But he added, that being sincerely anxious for the restoration of harmony between our respective officers, he thought that the interdict had perhaps better not, in prudence, be recalled, until after the lapse of some little interval—a month or two he intimated—that feeling on each side might have time to cool. He handed me the correspondence between Governor Don and Captain Brown, of our sloop the Peacock, in March, which treats of the disputes, and particularly of the duel between lieutenant Downing, of the frigate Guerriere, and lieutenant Smith of the garrison. His lordship desired to be understood as having no complaints to allege on behalf of his government, and expressed regret that Governor Don, who had acted from the best motives, had not been furnished with a copy of the proceedings of the court martial by which Mr.

Downing had been acquitted. He concluded by referring to the letter addressed by the Navy Department to Commodore Stewart, by order of the President, in September last, (the same which I read to Lord Castlereagh) respecting the former duels; a copy of which had also reached this government through Governor Don. His lordship said, that the sentiments of the President, so appropriate and conciliatory, had made upon His Majesty the impression they were justly calculated to produce, and requested that I would convey this assurance to my government.

April 15. Dined at the Middle Temple, with Mr. George Joy, formerly of Boston. It was a bachelor's dinner. The room in which we dined, claimed the double distinction of having been the one in which Rogers wrote the "Pleasures of Memory," and which the late Lord Chief Justice Ellenborough occupied when at the Bar.

General Sir George Walker, Mr. S. Williams of Boston, and Mr. J. Adams Smith, the Secretary of my Legation, were our party. The first had served in the wars of the Peninsula, under the Duke of Wellington, and was at the storming of Badajoz in 1812. His brigade was of nine hundred strong, and more than half fell. The remainder mounted the bastion from the river side, by

ladders, and were among the successful. These were some particulars which he mentioned of that fearful night, for it was a night assault. The whole loss to the British army, he stated at about five thousand, including three hundred officers. Sir George himself received a musket ball in his body, and five bayonet wounds. His shattered frame sufficiently bespoke how he had suffered, but he seemed to have lost none of the animation of his mind.

Until this occasion, I was under an impression that the Duke of Wellington never was wounded; but Sir George Walker said, that not long after the storming of Badajoz, he was struck by a random musket ball in the side, in an affair with the French on the borders of France. It was merely a slight wound, and was dressed on the spot. The Duke, on receiving it, exclaimed, "Hit at last," and seemed pleased.

April 18. Dined at Lord Harrowby's, who entertained the diplomatic corps. If Mr. Joy's dining-room was immortalized by the "Pleasures of Memory," his Lordship's dining-room came near to gaining a very different kind of immortality; it being the one in which the cabinet were to have dined with him on the evening that Thistlewood had fixed upon for murdering them all. This was not overlooked in our conversation; but we had other and more cheerful

topics. Among the varieties of wine, we had hock of the vintage of 1648, of which it was remarked by our accomplished host, that King Charles might have drank it.

April 20. Dined at Lord Castlereagh's. We had the diplomatic corps, and several foreigners of distinction.

His lordship informed me, that he had mentioned to Count Lieven, the Russian Ambassador, the desire of our two countries to ask the friendly umpirage of his sovereign, respecting the contested point between us under the Treaty of Ghent; and that the Count had, within a few days, shown him a dispatch from Count Nesselrode, by which it appeared, that the Emperor would probably not object to lending himself to the joint wish of the two nations. His lordship added, that Mr. Bagot, who is expected to set out on his embassy in about a month, would be instructed to make the proper application to the Emperor, on the part of Great Britain, as soon as the Minister of the United States at St. Petersburgh was prepared to unite in it. I replied, that Mr. Campbell had already been, as I believed, instructed to do so; on which his lordship remarked, that he was not aware of any other steps necessary for either party to take at present.

The minister from ******* told me that the

Ottoman Porte had recently been supplying Algiers with additional munitions of war, and avows a determination to protect the Barbary States; and that this determination would restrain the European Alliance from any measures of immediate coercion against those states. I asked, Why *restrain?* He answered, that the Sovereigns probably had it in mind to hold the Porte ultimately responsible for such a line of policy.

April 22. Dined at Mr. Robinson's, Somerset-Place. Besides Mr. Robinson, we had, of the Cabinet, the Chancellor of the Exchequer—Mr. Vansittart; the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster—Mr. C. Bathurst; and Lord Mulgrave; also, Sir William Grant, late Master of the Rolls; Mr. Planta; Mr. Hobhouse, of the Home Department; Mr. Angerstein, and other gentlemen; and the presence of Lady Sarah Robinson, and other ladies, added to the attractions of the table.

In the course of the evening, conversation turned on the Cato street conspiracy, the trial of the offenders being in progress at the Old Bailey, and two of them, Thistlewood and Ings, having been convicted of high treason. What follows, was mentioned in connexion with this plot, namely: that as soon as the precise knowledge of it came to the ears of the Cabinet, through the disclosures made to Lord Har-

rowby in the Park, the members met to determine upon their course. Some were for going to the dinner at Lord Harrowby's in the face of it all. They reasoned thus; that it seemed so desperate, that it would not be believed, unless the conspirators actually came to Lord Harrowby's house; that they, therefore, ought to be allowed to do so, if such were really their intention; otherwise, the public might have room to say that the Ministers had been over credulous, and disposed to make the plot appear so very horrible, only to excite indignation, and gain strength by suppressing it; and as to their personal safety, *that* might be secured by arming themselves, in addition to stationing proper guards in and near the house; and that the latter also, would be the most certain way of capturing the whole of the conspirators, so that none might escape.

Those who took a different view of the subject said, that His Majesty's Ministers being in possession of evidence to satisfy reasonable men, that a guilty purpose existed, they ought not to wait for the consummation of the crime, but arrest it in its progress; that public justice, and even humanity itself, dictated this course, as life might be endangered, no matter what precautions were taken before-hand, if the conspirators were allowed to go on to the last step; that Ministers, conscious of the rectitude of their intentions, and not acting hastily

but on full deliberation and advice, must not regard public clamor, but consign the whole transaction to the judicial tribunals of the country without any delay that could be avoided, and abide the issue.

This is the course which it is known was adopted. It was further mentioned, that Lord Castlereagh was for going to the dinner in the face of it all at the hour invited, as if nothing had happened, and letting each gentleman arm himself if he thought proper; whilst the Duke of Wellington counselled to the course which was adopted.

Mr. Robinson's residence is in one of the buildings within the quadrangle of Somerset House. When we had gone up to coffee, I approached with some of the company one of the back windows of the drawing-room which overlooks the Thames, where you here see three of the great bridges, Waterloo, Black-friars, and Westminster. All were well lighted up, which makes this city view very striking by night, to those who see it for the first time.

CHAPTER XVI.

VISIT FROM MR. WILBERFORCE—THE SLAVE TRADE—PIRACY—IMPRESSMENT. CATO STREET CONSPIRACY—FIVE OF THE CONSPIRATORS CONVICTED AND EXECUTED. DROITS OF THE CROWN. DINNER AT LORD MELVILLE'S—DEATH OF COMMODORE DECATUR. VISIT TO THE ROYAL ARSENAL AT WOOLWICH. ARRIVAL OF THE QUEEN, LATE PRINCESS OF WALES, AT DOVER. SPECIAL AUDIENCE OF THE KING. DINNER AT PRINCE LEOPOLD'S. DINNER AT LORD CASTLEREAGH'S—UNUSUAL INCIDENTS AT IT. THE KING'S LEVEE—CONVERSATION WITH MR. CANNING ON THE PUBLIC SPEAKING IN THE TWO HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT. DINNER AT MR. CANNING'S.

April 24. To-day I had a visit from Mr. Wilberforce. He touched upon several subjects, amongst them, Mr. Walsh's book. I found that he did not like the parts about slavery, and so expressed himself, in regret rather than censure. I remarked that I thought allowances were to be made for us on that subject, considering the history of it from the day

we were part of the British empire. He asked where Mr. Walsh received his education. I told him in the United States. He admitted that he was a man of abilities.

I asked him if there was no philanthropist in England disposed, at this season of general peace, to exert himself for the abolition of privateering, as he had done to put down the slave trade. He replied that civilization and Christianity seemed equally to call for it. I said, let England, as the greatest maritime power, set the example, and other nations would follow.

I next asked, and is there no man among you willing to devote himself to another labor of humanity, the abolition of impressment? He joined in lamenting the evils to which it led, and said that he had hoped Sir Thomas Ackland would take it up in the House of Commons. I said that if an end were put to it in England, as a home measure, an immense good would follow internationally, by the extinction of a cause of dissension, the most formidable that could exist, between our two countries. He rejoined that it was deeply important under that view.

After Mr. Wilberforce left me, I called on Sir Thomas Lawrence, (who had recently returned from the continent,) for the purpose of obtaining information respecting the portrait of Mr. West.

He remarked, that the death of Mr. West would not rob the picture of any advantage, the likeness having been complete as far as he could render it so, before he died. He further said, that the last injunction he had received from Mr. West before setting out upon his tour was, "on no account to touch the head again," "the venerable President being pleased to add," contiued Sir Thomas, that it was "already perfect."

Should these last lines ever chance to meet the eye of any member of the Academy of Fine Arts in New York, whose walls I suppose still to be graced with this portrait of so distinguished a native son of America, it may not be unwelcome to him thus to know what Mr. West's own opinion of it was, as thus expressed to Sir Thomas Lawrence, before he died.

April 28. Parliament was opened yesterday by the King in person. I attended under the usual notice to the foreign ministers from the Master of Ceremonies. The speech was general in its terms; so much so that the address to the throne in reply to it, passed both Houses without opposition. The new House of Commons is considered to be as favorable to the ministry as the last, if not more so.

April 29. In my dispatch to the Secretary of

State I mention, as marking the end of the Cato street conspiracy, that five of the conspirators, including Thistlewood the ringleader, had been convicted of high treason; that the remainder, six in number, had pleaded guilty; and that the five convicted by the jury had confessed, after conviction, that it was their intention to murder the Ministers. Their plan it seems was, that if they had got to the house of Lord Harrowby, some one of their number was to knock at the door with a note in his hand, under pretence of desiring it to be delivered to Lord Harrowby, doing this in a manner to excite no suspicion in case of any one accidentally passing along the pavement. The rest of the band, from twenty to thirty in number, were to be close at hand, but subdivided into squads, the better to be out of view, which the night would have favored. The servant opening the door, was to have been instantly knocked down by this leader who carried the feigned note; and the opening of the door was to be the signal for the whole band to rush forward, enter the house, make for the dining room, and had they found the Ministers there, kill the whole if possible, and as fast as possible, not sparing one, or even the servants who might have attempted to obstruct their passage onward. They had counted on the presence of from twelve to fifteen members of the Cabinet at the dinner table. Thistlewood had once been an officer in

the militia, and afterwards for a short time in the line of the British army in the West Indies, and was a daring, desperate man.

May 1. Thistlewood and four of the conspirators are hung.

May 7. Write to Mr. Crawford, Secretary of the Treasury. Inform him that I will in future send for the library of his department, all the documents published by both Houses of Parliament every session according to his request. I call his attention to the debate in the House of Commons on the droits of the Crown, pointing out the speech of Sir James Macintosh from the justice it renders to the United States at the breaking out of the war of 1812, in not seizing the property of the co-belligerent found within their jurisdiction; but on the contrary, allowing six months after the declaration of war for all British merchant ships to get off, and afterwards even enlarging that period; which Sir James characterized as conforming to the beneficent old common law principle of magna charta, which England, he said, had departed from.

May 16. Dined at Lord Melville's, the first Lord of the Admiralty. Mr. Rose, British Minister at Berlin, and Mrs. Rose; the Russian Ambassador and

Countess Lieven; Lord and Lady Binning; Lady Castlereagh, the Ambassador from the Netherlands, Mr. Planta, Mr. Bagot, and others—made the company. Among the table ornaments, was a very beautiful representation of Neptune, in alabaster, holding in his hand the trident of the ocean.

Topics during the dinner and evening, were such as the new reign suggested. One other, a foreign topic, shared attention—the death of Commodore Decatur; the account of whose fall in a duel with Commodore Barron near Washington, the latter being severely wounded, had just become known in London. To Mr. Bagot, who sat next to me, I spoke of him, lamenting in his death the loss of a personal friend, and old school-mate, besides his loss to his country. It was known to me, that Mr. Bagot had made his acquaintance, in Washington, as well as that the Commodore's accomplished wife was known to Mrs. Bagot. Mr. Bagot spoke of him in the handsomest terms, not for my ear alone, but that of the company also. His closing words were, "All that he said or did, was ever carried off with a soldierly grace." And, let that old school-mate and friend pay him the passing tribute of adding, to words so true, that a lofty patriotism ever animated all his thoughts and deeds; that he was a shining example to others in a profession which he desired to lift up to the highest pitch, not only by his valor and naval

accomplishments, but by the noble ambition of intellectual improvement in other fields, which he seemed to cherish but the more with advancing years; so that, had he lived longer, his country might have beheld in him a fame even more full-orbed than that which his untimely death cut short.

May 17. Attended the King's levee, though not yet having received my new letters of credence. One of my objects was to see the Duke of Wellington, and endeavor to obtain some information respecting the course of education pursued with the military cadets in England, as far as the system was in print, or its rules otherwise made public. I saw the Duke, who said he was not sure that there was much in print on the subject, but promised me all that was to be had, saying there were no secrets about it.

May 26. Visited the royal arsenal and other military establishments at Woolwich. Taking letters from the Duke of Wellington to Lieutenant General Ramsay, and to the Lieutenant Governor of the Royal Military Academy, I saw every thing; and to far more advantage, than I could undertake to describe it. The cannon foundry; the places for smith's work, carpenter's work, and for making cartridges, bomb-shells, grenades and shot; the various machinery; the barracks, and places for manufactur-

ing Congreve rockets; the boring houses; model houses—any single one of these items, not to mention others, might overtask my powers of minute description. There seemed to be stores and military supplies of every description, for all the exigencies of war, even to sand-bags, fascines and scaling ladders, and whether for land or sea-service, accumulated in vast heaps. The cannon in depot, amounted to from twenty-five to thirty thousand pieces. The whole number, it was said, would cover fourteen acres. It is known that not only did the British army draw its supplies from this great establishment during the late European wars, but that the troops of the continental powers were largely supplied also from its almost inexhaustible stores. It was stated that often, whilst hostilities were going on, a million of ball cartridges for muskets, were among the weekly issues from the proper workshop.

The party with me consisted of Mr. McKenzie and other gentlemen. Rockets were let off, about a dozen in number, under the direction of Sir William Congreve, that we might see the effect of horizontal firing with them. Those designed to be thrown into towns, or otherwise to produce a conflagration, were in part composed of combustibles, prepared by Dr. McCulloch, the chemist of the establishment, which are scarcely to be extinguished by water, resembling in this respect the old Greek fire. One was ignited

for our inspection, upon which water was thrown without putting out the flame. Some of the artillery were exercised, daily, in firing at a target with ball cartridge. The artillery, now reduced to seven or eight thousand, had amounted to thirty thousand during the war. The wood work for the carriages and other apparatus, was of oak, ash or elm. We visited the range of stables where the artillery horses were kept. They were fine looking animals, and we were told cost the government about fifty pounds sterling apiece.

The barracks for the troops were extensive, and seemed highly complete and comfortable. The dining room of the officers, and two drawing rooms adjoining, were spacious and well furnished. Another part of the building has the advantage of an extensive library, and a reading room. At a little distance from the principal barracks, stands a row of small brick houses, all white, looking very neat. These were built for such of the common soldiers as were married; and we learned that the number of school mistresses attached to the whole British army, for instructing children born in the families of the common soldiers, was very great.

In the model room, we saw curious weapons of different ages and countries. They were chiefly brought from Paris after the conquest of 1814, and had been accumulated in that capital from all parts

of the world, as French trophies. Enough there was, to fix the eye of the warrior, and raise reflections in the moralist. We saw the armor of the Chevalier Bayard, and the identical mask worn by the "man in the iron mask." The latter was wholly closed up in the face, except a small aperture, made to open and shut, through which food was introduced. In the same room was a plan, upon a large scale, of Quebec.

Repairing to the Military Academy, we were shown that part of the system. We saw plans and drawings of all kinds of fortifications, and all manner of instruments necessary for carrying on a military education. Models of Gibraltar and Bergen-op-zoom were in view, executed in wood, like that of Quebec. The cadets were at their studies, sitting at forms in three rows; their uniform, blue faced with red. Their hours of study, in presence of a professor, were from nine until twelve in the forenoon, and from three until five in the afternoon. A lieutenant-governor, an inspector, and four professors, were the officers of the Institution. The cadets receive from government two shillings and six-pence sterling a day, which supplies them with clothes and pocket money, and in all other respects are found by the Institution. The situation is in much request, and the Institution contained about one hundred and fifty cadets. Besides their own exercises in the field,

they have the advantage, from being close to the Royal Artillerists at the barracks, of witnessing all the evolutions of the latter. The Military Academy at Sandhurst, designed chiefly for the sons of British officers who fall in battle, or otherwise perish in the service, contained, we were informed, about three hundred cadets, and fifteen or twenty teachers. The branches taught at each were much the same, and consisted mainly of ancient and modern history, modern languages, fortification, gunnery, drawing, and mathematics.

We finished the visit by partaking of a collation at the quarters of Colonel Brigham, whose obliging attentions we all experienced.

June 6. Went to the House of Lords, under a notice received from Sir Robert Chester, to witness the ceremony of the King giving his assent to some bills. It seems that by ancient usage, the Sovereign gives his assent, in person, to the first bill which Parliament passes after the commencement of a new reign. On this occasion, it was the bill establishing the civil list, to which he assented; and some others being ready, he assented to them also. In the Ambassador's box we had, besides the Corps proper, Count Rostopchin, Governor of Moscow when it was burnt, during the invasion of Napoleon, in 1812. He came with the Russian Ambassador; and we

had also Prince Lichenstien, who came with the Austrian Ambassador.

There was a thinner attendance than usual of members of the Cabinet, in the House of Lords, and about the Throne. This was noticed in our box; and there seemed something of coldness in the whole ceremony; for which, perhaps, the Queen's arrival at Dover yesterday, served to account.

June 14. Had a special audience of the King to deliver my new credentials. I had written to Lord Castlereagh to ask it, and his answer appointed to-day, of which I informed the Master of Ceremonies. The latter conducted me to the door of the audience room in the Palace. The King was attended by Lord Bathurst. I delivered the President's autograph letter to His Majesty, using much the same language as when delivering my credentials to him as Prince Regent, mentioned in Chapter VIII. of the former volume, and was received in the same way.

The new Spanish Ambassador, the Duke de Frias, also had his audience of reception, as successor to the Duke of San Carlos, recalled since the change of government in Spain.

In the evening, I dined at Prince Leopold's, Marlborough House, who entertained a portion of the Diplomatic Corps and other guests; amongst them, the Bishop of Salisbury, who superintended the

education of the Princess Charlotte. Our distinguished host dispensed his attentions cordially to his company. The appointments of the table, were beautiful; the plate and other ornaments, having been selected for the heiress presumptive to the throne on the occasion of her marriage to Prince Leopold.

June 15. Attended the Drawing Room, and at seven in the evening dined at Lord Castlereagh's. We had all the foreign Ambassadors and Ministers, with other guests, Lord Strangford of the number, whose literary accomplishments make him so well known.

A very few minutes after the last course, Lord Castlereagh, looking to his chief guest for acquiesence, made the signal for rising, and the company all went into the drawing rooms. So early a move was unusual; it seemed to cut short, unexpectedly, the time generally given to conversation at English dinners, after the dinner ends. It was soon observed that his lordship had left the drawing rooms. This was still more unusual; and now it came to be whispered, that an extraordinary cause had produced this unusual scene. It was whispered by one and another of the Corps, that his lordship had retired into one of his own apartments to meet the Duke of Wellington, as his colleague in the adminis-

tration, and also Mr. Brougham and Mr. Denman, as Counsel for the Queen, on the disputes pending between the King and Queen.

The Queen's arrival in England, was unexpected to the King and his ministers, and was well understood to have been against the strong wishes of both. The event produced much excitement, and suspended in a great degree the interest of other political topics. As soon as she landed, the ministers took their measures for instituting proceedings against her in Parliament on the ground of imputed misbehavior since she was last abroad. She denied the imputations and called for proof. The proceedings against her, which originated in a message from the King to both Houses, had actually commenced, but were arrested in the House of Commons by a portion of the members purporting to be common friends of both King and Queen, who desired that a subject so unfitted for public discussion, should, if possible, be compromised. The dinner at Lord Castlereagh's was during this state of things, which explains the incidents at its close, the disputes having pressed with anxiety on the King's ministers. That his lordship did separate himself from his guests for the purpose of holding a conference, in another part of his own house, in which the Duke of Wellington joined him, as representing the King, while Mr. Brougham and Mr. Denman represented the Queen, was known

from the formal protocol afterwards published, of what took place on that evening. It was the first of the conferences held with a view to a compromise between the royal disputants.

June 27. I learn from a good source that the dissolution of the late government at Buenos Ayres, has been attended with circumstances so important as to induce Sir Thomas Hardy, the British naval officer in command in that quarter, to dispatch one of the vessels of his squadron to England with a special account of them.

June 28. Attend the levee at Carlton Palace. Converse with several of the Diplomatic Corps on the state of things between the King and Queen. All are full of the topic. ******** says, that the sensibilities of the King are intense and vehement; nothing can ever reconcile him. He also says, that, of the royal dukes, **** and ******, and one other, go with the King; not so certain as to the rest. And he adds, that the Ministers, almost unanimously, are now satisfied, that there are grounds to go upon, against the Queen. None of the Corps dare touch the subject, at least in the present stage of it, with any of the Cabinet; so I suppose, it being none of their concern; but things leak out, for in England every thing soon becomes known.

I converse with Mr. Canning on the style of speaking in the House of Commons. I mention Sir James Macintosh's remark; he accedes to it; says it is true, as a general rule, that their speaking must take *conversation* as its basis, rather than any thing studied, or stately; the House was a business-doing body, and the speaking must conform to its character; it was jealous of ornament in debate, which, if it came at all, must come, as without consciousness. There must be method also; but this should be felt in the effect, rather than seen in the manner; no formal divisions, exordiums, or perorations, as the old rhetoricians taught, would do. First, and last, and every where, you must aim at reasoning; and if you could be eloquent, you might, at any time, but not at an appointed time. Such, in effect, was what he said. Foremost himself as a speaker in the House of Commons, for his day, perhaps in its most brilliant sphere of oratory, I listened with interest whilst such a master casually spoke on the subject.

I spoke of the House of Lords; remarking, that in that body indeed, I had anticipated a style of speaking somewhat more like conversation, not only from its fewer numbers, but component materials; but that, to my observation, its oratory seemed rather elaborate and ambitious, with much that would seem to indicate painstaking, in a degree beyond that which I had witnessed in the House of Commons.

He acquiesced; but added, that some of its chief speakers had been formed in the House of Commons. I replied, that perhaps that might account for what had also struck me, so far, in listening to the debates of each House; namely, that the average speaking among the peers, was best. He agreed to it, as a present fact; remarking, that another reason perhaps was, that the House of Peers, for its numbers, was better stocked with men thoroughly educated.

The day was hot—excessively so, for England. The King seemed to suffer; he remarked upon the heat, to me, and others. It is possible, that other causes may have aggravated, in him, that feeling. Before he came into the entrée rooms from his closet, ****** of the diplomatic corps, taking me gently by the arm, led me a few steps, which brought us into the recess of a window. "Look," said he. I looked—I saw nothing but the velvet lawn, shaded by trees in the palace gardens. "Look again," he said. I did—still my eye took in only another part of the same scene. "*Try once more,*" said he, cautiously raising a finger in the right direction. ****** had a vein of drollery in him. I now, for the first time, beheld a peacock, displaying his plumage. At one moment, he was in full pride, and displayed it gloriously as he strutted along the lawn; at another, he would halt, letting it droop, as if dejected. In his wake, a smaller bird,

of glossy feathers, (a female as he declared) followed, teasing and annoying the peacock, at every turn. "Of what does that remind you," said ******. "Ah!" said I, "*Honi soit qui mal y pense*," for I threw the King's motto at him; and added, that as I was a republican and *he* a monarchist, if he dreamt any more of unholy comparisons where royalty was concerned, I would certainly tell upon him, that it might be reported to his court! He quietly drew off from me, smiling; and I afterwards saw him slyly take another member of the corps to the same spot, to show him the same sight.

July 10. Dined at Mr. Canning's, Gloucester-Lodge. We had Sir William Scott; Sir William Grant; Mr. Wilmot, of the House of Commons; Mr. Planta; Mr. Backhouse; Mr. Stratford Canning; Mr. Smith, of the House of Commons; Mr. Frere, British Minister in Spain during the campaign of Sir John Moore, and the Marquis of Tichfield.

The conversation was in part literary. Mr. Canning, Mr. Frere, Sir William Scott, and Sir William Grant, were all members of the Literary Club, so well known in Johnson's time, and still kept up. Its number is limited to forty, and its meetings are held at the Thatched House. Sir William Scott was intimate with Johnson, and one of his executors.

The authorship of Junius became a topic, the

death of George III. having occasionally revived it. Most of the company held the belief, or inclined to it, that Sir Philip Francis was the man. I observed that Sir William Scott did not join in this opinion, but expressed no open dissent. It seemed with him, *Curia advisare vult!* He remarked, that it was no new thing in English literature for the author of a celebrated work to remain unknown; this was still the case with the book entitled "The Whole Duty of Man," written in the time of the Stuarts.

Mr. Canning related an anecdote pertinent to the topic, derived from the present King, when Prince of Wales. It was to the following effect. The late King was in the habit of going to the theatre once a week, at the time Junius's letters were appearing, and had a page in his service of the name of Ramus. This page always brought the play-bill in to the King, at tea-time, on the evenings when he went. On the evening before Sir Philip Francis sailed for India, Ramus handed to the King, at the same time when delivering the play-bill, a note from Garrick to Ramus, in which the former stated that there would be no more letters from Junius. This was found to be the very night on which Junius addressed his laconic note to Garrick, threatening him with vengeance. Sir Philip did embark for India the next morning, and, in point of fact, the letters ceased to appear from that day. The anecdote added, that

there lived with Sir Philip, at the time, a relation of Ramus's, who sailed in the morning with him. The whole narrative excited much attention, and was new to most of the company. The first impression it made was, not only that it went far towards showing, by proof almost direct, that Sir Philip Francis was the author, but that Garrick must have been in the secret.

The style of the letters was criticised. Mr. Canning did not think very highly of it; nor did Sir William Scott, though not going as far in dispraise as Mr. Canning. Sir William Grant also said, that Fox never admired the style.

Mr. Canning asked me, if Mr. Walsh would not be satisfied with what the Edinburgh Review had said of his work. Sir William Scott said, that he thought he ought to be. Sir William admitted that he had read it, and that it was a book that ought to be read. He expressed no further opinion. Mr. Canning said that he had looked into it, without yet having been able to go through it as he wished. Sir William Grant mentioned that he was at Quebec when it was attacked by our troops under Montgomery, in '75. He remarked, that Montgomery had fallen gallantly, but added that the attack was very desperate. I said that his name was still dear to us; it lived in our patriotic celebrations.

We sat at table until past eleven, and I only give

scraps of the conversation. It flowed tranquilly on, with unstudied point and ease the whole time, from a company, than which it would, perhaps, not have been easy to assemble in England, one of the same size, comprising more of intellectual power, in union with personal accomplishments.

July 12. Went with my family last night to see the Comedy of Errors. We were in the private box of Mr. Coutts. Jones and Comer performed the two Antipholis', and Liston and Farren the two Dromios. Miss Stephens gave us the echo song.

CHAPTER XVII.

INTERVIEW WITH LORD CASTLEREAGH ON THE WEST INDIA TRADE, AND OTHER SUBJECTS. UMPIRAGE OF THE EMPEROR OF RUSSIA, UNDER THE DISPUTED ARTICLE OF THE TREATY OF GHENT. DINNER AT THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON'S; AT LORD CASTLEREAGH'S; AT MR. PLANTA'S; AT THE DUKE OF SUSSEX'S. THE DISPUTE BETWEEN THE KING AND QUEEN. REVOLUTION IN SPAIN. COURSE OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT IN RELATION TO IT.

July 13. Had an interview with Lord Castlereagh at his house, St. James's street. It was for the purpose of expressing to him the sentiments of my Government, in regard to the commercial intercourse between the United States and the British West Indies, and North American Colonies. I said that after the unfortunately abortive discussions between the two countries on this subject, it might seem almost superfluous to recur to it again; but that I had the instructions of my Government to do so. I was merely told to reiterate assurances, that

the supplementary act of Congress, passed on the 15th of May, with a view to render more complete the prohibitions which the United States had found it necessary to impose on this intercourse, had been adopted in no unfriendly spirit, but solely in the hope of securing to their citizens, that equal share of the shipping employed in the trade, which substantial reciprocity was thought to call for; and that whenever a disposition was felt by His Majesty's Government, to allow this object to be secured to us by a commercial arrangement between the two countries, it would be met by the President with an earnest wish to substitute a system of the most liberal intercourse, in place of the interdictions by statute, to which we had finally, though with reluctance, had recourse.

His lordship replied, that no unfriendly policy on our part, was inferred by His Majesty's Government from the measure in question. Far from it. It was considered simply as a commercial regulation of our own, adopted to meet theirs, and in nowise incompatible with the relations of harmony subsisting between the two nations, which he hoped might long continue.

I now introduced the subject of the design imputed to France to erect a throne at Buenos Ayres, and place a Prince of the Bourbon line upon it. I said that I had no information from my Government on

this subject; but that if the accounts were well-founded, I knew how my Government and country would deplore such a course on the part of France. His lordship replied, that it was a total surprise upon England; that the Cabinet had heard nothing of it until very recently, and were still willing to hope that it might not prove true in the extent stated; otherwise it showed a spirit of intrigue which he had hoped, had gone out of fashion among nations. It was the more strange in the eyes of England, as it had been going on, if true, at the very time when the Foreign Enlistment Bill was brought before Parliament. I remarked upon the difference between the course of the United States and France; for that whilst we had expressly disclaimed all intention of accepting any special advantages over other nations from the new South American communities, it appeared, if the accounts were true, that France was for appropriating every advantage to herself. He admitted that the disclosures wore that appearance, but again expressed the hope that they might not prove well founded.

I mentioned to his lordship before coming away, the arrival of Mr. Middleton in London, on his way to St. Petersburg, as successor to Mr. Campbell, our present Minister at that court, who was about to retire from the mission at his own request; and asked leave to introduce him to his lordship at

any time when convenient; on which he named the day following.

July 14. Call on Lord Castlereagh with Mr. Middleton. After the introduction, Mr. Middleton mentioned his desire to arrange with the aid of my instrumentality, should any correspondence or other official acts with His Majesty's Government be required, (he not being accredited to the English court,) such preliminary points respecting the umpirage at St. Petersburg on the slave question under the Treaty of Ghent, as might be necessary to bring it before the Emperor for his decision. His lordship expressed his readiness to forward whatever objects Mr. Middleton had in view, that could be effected here; and it need scarcely be added, that my cooperation whenever it could in any way be rendered useful, was as fully tendered.

July 15. Dined at the Duke of Wellington's. The Rt. Hon. W. W. Pole, of the Cabinet, and Mrs. Pole; Lady Ann Cullen Smith; Colonel Percy; Mr. and Mrs. Patterson, of Baltimore, and Miss Caton, of Annapolis; the Duchess of Wellington; my wife; the Reverend Gerald Wellesley, and other gentlemen, were of the company.

We went to dinner punctually a few minutes after

seven, and what follows passed at table, or afterwards in the drawing room.

Speaking of the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich, when I alluded to my visit there, under the Duke's obliging auspices, he said that one hundred and fifty cadets, a number which to me had appeared small for the whole British army, were found enough; as it was only for the artillery and engineers that the Academy educated young men. The Military School at Sandhurst, was designed, he said, for young men who went into the line. The establishment at Woolwich he thought, on the whole, as complete as any one of a similar nature known to him in Europe. Speaking of the Russian army, he said that it might probably be put down at from eight to nine hundred thousand men, and its annual expense at about nine millions sterling. The Russian soldiers, he added, were now well fed, well clothed, and well found in all respects. He remarked that the British army was the most expensive in Europe, and the Dutch next.

General Moreau was spoken of, who fell at Dresden. I said that when he was in the United States, I had once passed an evening in his company; and that he spoke of his sensations of delight on gaining his first victory, saying that he then "felt on a level with his profession." The Duke remarked, that were he to speak of his feelings when it had been

his fortune to gain a battle, he would say, that they had generally been painful; for there was grief, for those who had fallen; and next, it imposed instantly the necessity of doing more, as no commander could remain quiet after victory; a larger view opened to him, often causing anxiety from the difficulties to be overcome, for insuring further advantages. I said that it was a remark of Moreau's, made on the same occasion, that the fault with most commanders, however brave, was backwardness in taking the last step to bring on a battle, especially when armies were large, arising from deep moral anxiety; and, after all, the uncertainties of the issue. The Duke said it was a just remark.

The Archduke Charles of Austria being spoken of, the Duke repeated in effect what I had heard him say to General Harper; namely, that he probably had more military science than any of the generals of Europe, contemporary with him. The conversation proceeding, the Duke remarked, in this connexion, that a general might stand too much upon the rules of science, while an engagement was going on; there could not be too much attention to them in all his arrangements beforehand, he said; but the battle once begun, "the main thing to think of, was hard fighting."

The Thistlewood conspiracy was touched upon, and some particulars related. One was, that on the

night of the Duke of San Carlos's entertainment in Portland Place when the Horse Guards were called out, it was believed that Thistlewood was in the crowd, intending mischief; but the presence of the Horse Guards had kept all quiet. When the daring character of the plot was spoken of, the Duke's opinion was, that if the conspirators had got into Lord Harrowby's dining room and found the Cabinet all at dinner, most of them would probably have been killed; "How," said he, taking a table knife in his hand, "could we have defended ourselves with a weapon like this, against men rushing in to murder us, armed with swords, pistols and hand grenades?" He said that having taken off the Ministers, their first step would probably have been to rob the banks in the Strand.

He asked me if there was any foundation for the rumor of our having any serious misunderstanding with France; he here alluded to a late act of Congress imposing a duty of eighteen dollars a ton upon French vessels in our ports. I said no, it was merely a measure of commercial policy—a countervailing measure on our side. He said that as far as he understood the question, we appeared to be in the right.

If the Duke's guests found the conversation interesting, his table called up historical reminiscences. When the desert courses came, the fruit dishes,

plates, vases, and other ornamental pieces of a service of China, presented to him by the King of Prussia, were illustrative of his own life. Each piece represented some passage in it. It began with a view of Deugan Castle, in Ireland, where he was born; gave you Eton in England, where he was educated; took you to India, and showed you Poonah, Assaye, Seringapatam, and other places marking his career of victory and fame in that country; brought you back to Europe, and gave you his achievements in the Peninsular war, Vimiera, Talavera, the lines of Torres Vedras, Badajoz, Vittoria, and so on; until, finishing the story of renown in the Peninsula, you come up to Belgium, where the overthrow of Napoleon, at Waterloo, closes the long scene of glory. One of the desert plates set before me, had the view of Busaco; another, that of Salamanca. Thus, all his campaigns were traced; and, with them, an outline of European and Asiatic history for a quarter of a century, in many of its decisive events. The paintings and scenery on each piece were beautifully executed. Pieces of another service, made at Dresden, and presented to the Duke by the King of Saxony, were on the table, and also historical.

I should sin almost against my country, to close the recollections of an evening so passed without saying, that none at table were better fitted to win

favorable opinions by all attractiveness and grace, than our fair countrywomen, Mrs. Patterson and Miss Caton, of Annapolis, grand-daughters of Carrol, of Carrolton. The former subsequently married the Marquis of Wellesley; the latter, Lord Stafford.

I take occasion to add, that the Duke sent me, with a courteous note, a paper containing the regulations which apply to the age, and course of study in detail, necessary to the admission of Cadets to the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich; which I transmitted to my Government for the use of the War Department.

July 19. I yesterday received, in a communication from Mr. Goulbourn, of the Colonial Department, the copy of a dispatch addressed on the sixteenth of June to Lord Bathurst, by the Governor of Gibraltar, respecting the differences which have existed between the officers of our squadron in the Mediterranean, and the British officers of that garrison. Annexed to it was also a copy of a letter of the third of June from Governor Don, to Commodore Bainbridge, of our flag-ship, Columbus. From these documents it appeared, that Governor Don considered the differences as all happily settled. I forwarded them to my government.

July 20. In a dispatch sent to the Secretary of

State, I mention that Mr. Stratford Canning had had his audience of leave of the King, and might be expected to embark soon for Washington. I also transmit to the Department a pamphlet containing all the documents, published in London, on the imputed designs of France to establish a throne at Buenos Ayres, and place upon it a Prince of the House of Bourbon, the subject having awakened attention in the highest political circles. I mention that the Duke de Cazes, the newly arrived Ambassador from France, did not admit the documents to be genuine, and disavowed ever having seen the South American Envoy, Gomez; but that whether he had disavowed for the Marquis Desolles also, I had not been informed. I allude to the debate in the House of Commons, on the call for information relative to these documents; in the course of which Dr. Lushington argued the broad principle that England ought to recognize, immediately and fully, the independence of Buenos Ayres, but that Lord Castlereagh had dissented from such a policy; and that Sir James Macintosh in his speech had intimated, that since the altered state of things in Spain, the question of desiring a separation of the colonies from the parent state, had essentially changed. I also call attention to what Mr. Canning said in the debate, viz. that as history had shown the condition of colonies to be more acquiescent and servile under

the government of popular assemblies, than under the authority of even absolute monarchies, (quære—has it?) all those who had wished to see the colonies emancipated from monarchical Spain, ought to cherish the wish more strongly, now that Spain had established a popular government.

I mention further, that our Minister in Spain, Mr. Forsyth, had written to me, that he understood, that the informal agents in London, from Caraccas, Buenos Ayres, and Chili, had held a meeting in May, at which it was determined to address applications to Russia, Austria, and Prussia, desiring that Princes of their families might be given to Spanish America generally; and that one might be specially selected from the Brazils, for Buenos Ayres—for so I read his letter; but I add, that as it came in cypher, there may have been some inadvertence in his copyist. I go on to inform the Secretary, that I was not aware of the facts mentioned in Mr. Forsyth's letter; but had been informed, that since the establishment of the Constitution of 1812 in Spain, the agents of Chili, Buenos Ayres, and Venezuela, did meet in London, though with a very different object; that it was jointly to sign, as they did sign, according to my information, an address to the King of Spain asking that their independence might be acknowledged; that this address was transmitted to Ferdinand through the Duke of San Carlos, then Spanish Am-

bassador in London, and that the answer, received through the same channel in London, was, that no proposition would be listened to, by *the Cortes* or King, that had not for its basis the return of the colonies to their subjection to the mother country.

At seven in the evening, dined at the Russian Ambassador's, where we had the Duke of York, the Duke de Cazes, newFrench Ambassador, with nearly all the diplomatic corps; also Lord Castlereagh, the Marquis and Marchioness of Stafford, Lord Palmerston, and some others. Conversation could not keep clear of the case of the Queen; not, indeed, as a general topic, but sometimes in under tones, two and two—so it was in my neighborhood.

July 22. Dined at Lord Castlereagh's. The dinner was given to the new French Ambassador. We had all the Foreign Ambassadors and Ministers, the Duke of Wellington, Lord Melville, Mr. Canning, Mr. C. Bathurst, Mr. Wellesley Pole, Lord Amherst, Mr. Planta, Lord Ancram, and others.

I sat next to the Duke of Wellington, and had much conversation with him, the dinner lasting a good while, and being too large for general conversation. He spoke of parts of the war in the Peninsula, in ways greatly to interest me. He also adverted to the designs of France upon Buenos Ayres, as imputed, which he hoped might not be true; if true,

they would show an intrigue, he said, which England would not like, and not belonging to the age, which had "excluded double-dealing from public affairs." I give his words. The member of the Bourbon family whom it was said France desired to put on a throne at Buenos Ayres, the documents stated to be, the Prince of Lucca, nephew to the King of Spain.

July 24. Dined at Mr. Planta's, New Burlington street. We had Lord Strangford; Mr. Stratford Canning; Mr. de Neuman, of the Austrian Embassy; Baron Bulow, of the Prussian; Mr. Fitzgerald; Mr. Gordon; and other English gentlemen.

Many subjects were touched; the Queen; Junius; Cobbett; the London newspapers. Regarding the last, the amount of capital, in money and mind, embarked in some of the leading ones, struck me as very remarkable, on facts that were mentioned; meaning by capital in *mind*, the men of education and talents, formed in the Universities or otherwise, who are silently auxiliary to the Editors. Lord Strangford, who had been British Minister at Rio Janiero, told me that he knew Mr. Sumpter, of South Carolina, our Minister at that Court, and esteemed him highly. His conduct in the affair of the Queen's carriage at Rio, which he narrated, was, he said, per-

fectly correct, to which the company appeared to assent.

July 26. Mr. and Mrs. Middleton, Mr. Stratford Canning, and Mr. Planta, dine with us. Mr. Canning's prospects in the United States, in the mission to which he is destined, become a topic, and Mr. Planta enlivens us with pleasant sallies on the whole subject.

July 27. Dined with His Royal Highness, the Duke of Sussex, at Kensington Palace. The Duke of Hamilton, the Earl of Thanet, Lord Ebrington, the Marquis of Tavistock, Lord Anson, Mr. Coke, General Fitzroy, and others, made the company.

At table I was between the Duke of Sussex and Duke of Hamilton. The latter had been much abroad, and talked on continental affairs, especially of the growing power of Russia.

The Duke of Sussex, sat at the head of his table in true old English style, and was full of cordiality and conversation. I cannot resist the satisfaction of putting down a small part of what fell from him. General principles of government coming to be spoken of, he expatiated on the benefits of free government; declaring, that as *all men, kings as well as others, were perpetually prone to abuse power when they*

got to the possession of it, the only safe course was, to limit its exercise by the strictest constitutional rules. In the palace of kings, and from the son and brother of a king, I should not have been quite prepared for this declaration, but that it was not for the first time I had heard him converse. The sentiments which it embodied, even with new strength and precision, I now listened to, with renewed pleasure. If such sentiments flourished so near the British throne, what may we not be allowed to think of the race of sturdy and spirited Englishmen, who settled the United States in the days of Elizabeth, Cromwell, and the Stuarts?*

August 12. The case of the Queen excites an interest so absorbing, that I thus reported to the Secretary of State its position and aspect.

I mentioned that all attempts at a compromise having failed, her case was transferred from the House of Commons to the House of Lords; that there was no abatement of the heats which it had produced; that

* Macauley, speaking of the civil wars in England, in his life of Milton, says, "The battle was fought for no single generation, for no single land. The destinies of the human race were staked on the same cast with the freedom of the English people. *Then* were proclaimed those mighty principles which have since worked their way into the depths of the American forests, which have roused Greece from the slavery and degradation of two thousand years, and which, from one end of Europe to the other, have kindled an unquenchable fire in the hearts of the oppressed."

the proceedings had taken the shape of a bill of pains and penalties, which a Committee of the Lords reported against her, and that it was under the allegations of this bill, that she was to be put upon her trial; that its provisions went to deprive her of all her rights and prerogatives as Queen consort of the realm, and to dissolve the marriage between herself and the King; and that the charge laid against her was that of misconduct with Bartholomew Bergami, an Italian, whom she took into her service, and advanced to a high station in her household.

I mentioned that these proceedings were strongly objected to, whatever might have been her misconduct. It was alleged that they overthrew the fundamental rule of British jurisprudence which separated judicial from legislative powers; that in this respect, a bill of pains and penalties, was like acts of attainder and confiscation, which were odious in English history, as associated with arbitrary times; that it overstepped all the ordinary barriers of the law, and was wounding to the constitution; that no private subject in Britain could obtain a sentence of divorce judicially, for the cause mentioned in the bill, without allowing to the respondent the right of recrimination, but that the Queen was entirely cut off from it. That she had also been refused a list of the witnesses against her, as well as a specification of the place or places where, or of the time when,

her imputed misconduct had taken place, all parts of the continent of Europe which she had visited during a space of six years, having been left open to her accusers on both those material heads; but in this connexion I mention also, that her accusers had given assurances that the proceedings against her would not be hurried to her disadvantage, for that after the testimony against her was closed, she would be allowed full time for taking measures to repel it.

I mentioned, that when the bill was reported in the House of Peers, Earl Grey declared that their Lordships, in consenting to act upon it, had placed themselves, for all that concerned the Queen's hopes of justice, and their own responsibilites, in the three-fold and awful situation of legislators, prosecutors, and judges; and that in the House of Commons, amongst other vehement denunciations of the bill from different members, Mr. Bennet had warned the Ministers against going on with a proceeding at the consequences of which the boldest mind might shudder.

I remarked, that whilst it belonged to the English, in Parliament and out of it, to exaggerate incidents of political danger, the question of the Queen's trial was, without doubt, one which seemed to be rising in importance under the keen personal sensibilities embarked in it on both sides; that there were not wanting persons who said, that should the Queen

be degraded, and the King embrace the option which would then be open to him of another marriage, and issue spring from it, the very succession to the monarchy might become endangered, as succeeding Parliaments had often been known to undo the acts of prior Parliaments passed in violation of received opinions of constitutional right; and because, not only the immediate brothers of the King, but their descendants, male and female, would have the great stake of a throne in the inculcation of that doctrine.

Such was the purport of my communication. I stated, also, that the session of Parliament might be considered as substantially at an end; that it had stood adjourned since the middle of July; and, although to meet again in a week from the time I wrote, it was not supposed that any further business would be done, beyond that which related to the Queen; her case occupying, since it first arose, so much of the time of both Houses, as to have abridged, in amount and interest, all other proceedings. That even the coronation, a ceremony which it was believed the King had much at heart, from the long interval since there had been one in England, was postponed on this account; and that thus the calls of public business, and desire of kingly display, were alike held in suspense by the dispute.

August 14. On the eleventh instant, Mr. Stratford Canning embarks on his mission to the United States, in the Spartan frigate, from Portsmouth.

August 17. Lord Holland rose in the House of Lords yesterday, and stated that he designed, at an early day, to put certain questions to ministers, for the purpose of obtaining information on the existing relations between Russia and England, on the one hand, and between Russia, England, and Spain, on the other. His reason for desiring the information arose, he said, from the manifesto recently issued by Russia, on the subject of the revolution in Spain; the principles contained in which, his Lordship denounced, as calculated to involve Europe in endless wars, and to endanger the peace and happiness of future generations. Lord Liverpool replied, that, when the questions were put in a regular form, he would be ready with the proper explanations, adding that there was nothing in the relations between England and Spain, that was likely to lead to a renewal of hostilities.

Subsequently, Lord Liverpool, in the House of Lords, and Lord Castlereagh, in the House of Commons, gave their explanations, on the part of the ministry, respecting Spanish affairs. They were, that Great Britain was no party to any league among the sovereigns of Europe, for interfering

with the cause of self-government in Spain, and that the communications from the British to the Spanish Government had been bottomed upon a desire to keep up the relations of amity between the two countries, as well as a wish that the proceedings going on, under the Cortes, might end in the establishment of a just and rational system of government for Spain; explanations which I communicated to the President, with the addition that Lord Castlereagh had expressed, in conversation, similar sentiments to me.

August 18. Mr. George Washington Campbell, our late Minister at Petersburg, here on his return to the United States, Mr. J. Adams Smith, and myself, pass the day in visiting Kew, Richmond, Twickenham, Hampton Court, and Windsor. At Windsor, we went through the principal part of the Castle. In the church near Richmond we saw the monument to Pope, and the one he erected to his nurse; at Twickenham, his villa, his grotto, the stump of his old willow, the column raised in honor of his mother, *et cetera.* We went to Strawberry Hill, and had a glance at that beautiful little gothic residence, rendered immortal by the prince of letter-writers, Horace Walpole. At Hampton Court, we saw the Maze, the enormous grape vine, and all the rooms of the Palace. At Kew, the gardens, and

rooms of the old Palace; the furniture of which had all been left as when they were last occupied by the Royal Family, the late Queen having died there. We went also to Runnymede, the famous scene of Magna Charta, which we were especially anxious to see. All this was a good day's occupation; but having, on this occasion, only one day to give to it, we were industrious, and had a bird's-eye view of things, though certainly not more. The day was fine, we were off by six in the morning, and got back to town at eight in the evening.

CHAPTER XVIII.

TRIAL OF THE QUEEN. AMERICAN VESSELS BOUND TO FRENCH PORTS, LAND THEIR CARGOES IN ENGLAND UNDER THE WAREHOUSING SYSTEM. CONTINUATION OF THE QUEEN'S TRIAL—MR. BROUGHAM. DINNER AT THE FRENCH AMBASSADOR'S AT HARROW, IN HONOR OF THE BIRTH OF THE DUKE OF BORDEAUX. RATIFICATION OF THE FLORIDA TREATY. DINNER AT THE SPANISH AMBASSADOR'S. TERMINATION OF THE QUEEN'S TRIAL—LONDON ILLUMINATED. DINNER AT MRS. PORTER'S—ANECDOTES OF NAPOLEON. DINNER AT THE FRENCH AMBASSADOR'S, PORTLAND PLACE. DINNER AT MR. TROTTER'S. PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT. LETTER TO MR. CRAWFORD, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY. PARLIAMENTARY REPORT ON THE FOREIGN TRADE OF ENGLAND. INTERVIEW WITH LORD CASTLEREAGH—UMPIRAGE OF THE EMPEROR ALEXANDER UNDER THE TREATY OF GHENT. CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE MINISTER OF STATE AT MADRID AND THE BRITISH AMBASSADOR, RESPECTING THE FLORIDA TREATY. PARTY AT PRINCE ESTERHAZY'S.

August 26. Went to the House of Lords to attend the trial of the Queen. The attendance of

Peers was very full. Lord Grenville, Lord Erskine, Lord Redesdale, Lord Liverpool, Lord Lansdowne and Lord Ellenborough, spoke to a point respecting the cross-examination of witnesses. No decision was pronounced. Mr. Brougham, leading counsel for the Queen, also addressed the House, after which an adjournment took place until Monday. I was immediately under the throne, being the place where the Foreign Ministers go, if inclining to attend.

August 30. Attend the trial of the Queen, the examination of witnesses still going on. The testimony is taken down by a short-hand writer and printed every day, from his notes, for the use of all parties. Counsel as well as Peers, are thus spared the labor of writing it down, and can be employing their minds instead of their hands.

September 4. Attend again; the examination of witnesses continues. Several Peers took part in the examination—Lord Liverpool, Earl Grey, Earl Grosvenor, the Duke of Hamilton, and others.

September 9. The House of Lords adjourn, to afford an interval for the Queen to prepare for her defence, the case having now been seventeen days under hearing.

September 20. Mr. Middleton left London yesterday. I communicate to my government a full account of all that was done with the British government during his stay, of more than two months, towards certain previous arrangements for bringing the slave question under the Treaty of Ghent, before the Emperor of Russia, as umpire; arrangements which would have been sooner perfected, but for impediments to business created by the case of the Queen. The precise nature of these arrangements need not be here stated, any more than others which afterwards became necessary, as the award was in favor of the United States, and was followed by a satisfactory settlement of the whole case, by payment on the part of England, as already mentioned in Chapter XIX. of the former volume.

September 30. Hearing that some of our vessels bound to French ports had been permitted to land their cargoes at British outports under the warehousing acts, the heavy tonnage duty in France causing the American owners to suspend their original destination, I went to the office of the Board of Trade to make application on the subject, and learned that it was the fact. I communicate the information to the Secretary of State, saying that I had reason to know that this government was not inattentive to the pro-

gress of our disputes with France respecting tonnage duties, and if they were not adjusted, would naturally turn them to account; more especially as they were occurring at a time when an extension of the warehousing system with a view to making England a centre of trade for the rest of the world, was becoming, as past communications from me had made known, more than ever a favorite object of her commercial policy.

October 3. The House of Lords re-assembled in continuation of the trial of the Queen. After some introductory remarks from Lord Liverpool, disavowing on the part of the government all improper dealing with the witnesses, (a disavowal induced by the published letter of a Mr. Marietti,) and stating his readiness to exhibit an account of all the monies paid to the witnesses in support of the bill, Mr. Brougham as counsel for the Queen, opened her case with great power and boldness. He declared that nothing should check him in fulfilling his duty, and that he would recriminate upon the King, if necessary. He said that an English advocate could look to nothing but the rights of his client, and that even should the country itself suffer, his feelings as a patriot must give way to his professional obligations. This I thought rather strong, if interpreted in the broad sense of which it is susceptible.

It is worth a passing notice, that during the adjournment of this momentous trial, Mr. Brougham attended the assizes at Yorkshire, and engaged in a cause on behalf of a poor old woman, upon whose *pig-cot* a trespass had been committed. It was on the side of a common of upwards of one hundred acres, upon about *five yards* of which the pig-cot was alleged to have encroached. The poor woman had paid the lord of the manor a yearly rent of *six pence* for it, and six pence on entering. The pig-cot having been pulled down, the jury found for the old woman, and gave her forty shillings damages. To have been counsel for the Queen of the Realm, and in such a case as this at the same time, is illustrative of the English bar; and, individually, of Mr. Brougham.

October 6. Go to the House of Lords. The Earl of Llandaff, Lady Charlotte Lindsay, the Hon. Keppel Craven, and Sir William Gell, are examined on the part of the Queen, several Peers taking part in the examination; amongst them, Lord Erskine, the Earl of Roseberry, and Earl Grosvenor.

October 9. Go again. Dr. Holland, Mr. Mills, and other witnesses, are examined in her behalf. The testimony has assumed aspects so much in her favor, that I hear from high sources that the Minis-

ters are almost brought to a stand, and that the bill will probably not be persisted in. *******, of the Corps, thinks that it will be given up.

October 10. After returning from the House of Lords yesterday, I went to dinner at the French Ambassador's, at Harrow. It was an entertainment, on a brilliant scale, given in honour of the birth of the Duke of Bordeaux, a new heir to the throne of the Bourbons. The foreign Ambassadors and Ministers were there, the Earl of Mansfield, Lord Northwick and others. A band of music was in attendance, playing at intervals, and the bells of Harrow rang merry peals. After dinner, from which we did not rise until a late hour, the house and grounds were illuminated, and the entertainment closed with an exhibition of fire-works at the bottom of the lawn. The inhabitants of Harrow and the neighborhood turned out in great numbers, and stood on the skirts of the lawn, gazing at the spectacle.

Lord Liverpool, Lord Castlereagh and other members of the Cabinet had been expected to this entertainment, and their absence was a great disappointment to the distinguished host. Dinner waited for them; none knew the cause of the delay, when at length a messenger came with an apology. It appeared that a council of the Ministers had been

unexpectedly summoned to meet at the palace on the case of the Queen.

October 14. The trial of the Queen proceeds. John Powell, Filippo Pomi, and others are examined.

October 16. Admiral Sir John Beresford and others are examined.

October 20. This morning I receive information from the Spanish Ambassador, of the ratification of the Florida treaty, and forthwith communicate it to my government, sending the dispatch to Liverpool to go by the first ship, for the chance of conveying the information to Washington, before it can arrive direct from Madrid.

October 24. The trial of the Queen goes on. Although I had information a fortnight ago that Ministers were deliberating as to an abandonment of the bill, subsequent testimony proving less favorable to her case, they determined to let it take its course; and I now write to my government that there seemed no certainty what would be the result.

November 11. Dined with the Duke de Frias, Spanish Ambassador. We had the Diplomatic

Corps in part, and several English gentlemen. With the Spanish Ambassador I had an exchange of congratulations on the final ratification at Madrid of the Florida treaty.

Mr. ****** told anecdotes of the Queen; amongst them, that when she lived at Blackheath, she had many a time played blind-man's-buff with Sir William Scott, Mr. Canning, and others who made up her parties. He also said that Bergami had declared that if he ever caught Alderman Wood in Italy, he would kill him, as he had been the means of making the Queen refuse fifty thousand pounds sterling a year from the government; of which sum, had it come into her hands, he, Bergami, would have had a handsome portion annually for life.

November 14. The trial is over, which has so much riveted public attention in England, and excited, to some extent, the attention of Europe. The report to my government of the final proceedings and result, was to the following effect:

I mention that the entire evidence and speaking being closed on the thirtieth of October, an adjournment of the House of Lords took place until the second of November; the testimony alone, independent of the speeches of counsel and all interlocutory debates among the Peers, having filled scarcely less than a thousand pages folio; that from the second of

November to the sixth, the Peers were occupied in debates upon the evidence, almost every member assigning reasons for the vote he intended to give; that on the sixth, the vote was taken and the bill passed to a second reading by a majority of twenty-eight. That on the eighth of November, another vote was taken as to whether the clause providing for a divorce should be maintained in the bill, and passed in the affirmative; that in regard to this vote, several of the Peers who were opposed to the principle of the bill, gave their votes in *favor* of the clause for a divorce, in the hope, which they avowed, of rendering the bill still more exceptionable with some of the members, (meaning the Bishops,) and thus increasing the chance of its ultimate defeat; and I also mention that the Ministers, who perceived this course, and were probably apprehensive of its effect, voted for striking out the divorce clause (otherwise known to be desired by the King) and found themselves in the minority.

I go on to state, that on the tenth of November the bill, with the divorce clause retained, was put to vote for a third reading; and that on this final vote it passed by a majority of nine, one hundred and eight voting for it, and ninety-nine against it; and that amongst those who voted in its favor were included the nine Peers who were members of the Cabinet, and the whole bench of Bishops, except

four; that the majority being thus slender, and thus composed, Lord Liverpool, as head of the Ministry, rose and abandoned all further prosecution of the bill, declaring that he did so on the double ground of the smallness of the majority, and the strongly expressed sense of the country against the measure. I add, that a large number of the Peers who voted against the bill, did not give their votes, as they expressly stated, on any clear belief in the Queen's innocence, but voted on the ground of the unconstitutionality and inexpediency of the bill; and I state further, as a curious fact, that the parts of the evidence which had borne hardest upon the Queen, and on which those who supported the bill were driven in the end to rely most, had come from witnesses called and examined in her defence.

Such is a synopsis of the account I transmitted. The debates among the Peers, grew stormy as the case approached its close. Earl Grey declared, that if their Lordships passed the bill, it would prove the most disastrous step the House had ever taken. Earl Grosvenor said, that feeling as he did the evils which the erasure of the Queen's name from the Liturgy (a measure adopted before her trial came on) was likely to entail upon the nation, as well as its repugnance to law and justice, he would, had he been Archbishop of Canterbury, have "*thrown the prayer-book in the King's face*," sooner than have

consented to it. On the other hand, the Duke of Montrose said, even after the Ministers had abandoned the bill, that so convinced was he of her guilt, that whatever others might think fit to do, he, for one, would never acknowledge her for his Queen.

London was illuminated, more or less, for three successive nights, under edicts put forth by popular feeling, at the overthrow of the bill. The streets, the theatres, the highways, gave testimony of the popular joy at the Queen's triumph; for so her friends and partizans called it, notwithstanding the loud assertions to the contrary kept up by those who took part against her.

An impartial spectator of the whole scene, admonished by his public situation to side with neither party, may be allowed to say, (what he thought and felt,) that the Ministry showed great wisdom in surrendering up their measure as an offering to popular feeling, though they had carried the bill. Lord Rosslyn, in the course of his powerful speech, put their wisdom in a strong light by saying, amongst his other objections to the measure, that, had it passed, it would have become a formidable rallying point for disaffection throughout the kingdom, and have tended to bring the House of Lords into disrepute, at a time when that branch of Parliament ought specially to desire and deserve popular approbation.

The trial exemplifies striking characteristics of the English nation. A majority of the Peers held on to it with a firmness that the Patricians of Rome could not have exceeded, until they carried their point by a conviction. Their sense of justice and pride satisfied, they allowed the popular parts of the constitution to have play. The people, inflamed by wrongs done to a woman as they viewed her cause, took it up with the unconquerable resolution of Roman Plebeians, and would probably not have yielded. But that which was perhaps most remarkable throughout the fierce contest, was the boundless range of the Press, and liberty of speech. Every day produced its thousand fiery libels against the King and his adherents; and caricatures, under the the worst forms, were hawked about all the streets. The Queen's counsel, Mr. Denman, addressing himself to the assembled peerage of the realm, denounced, in thundering tones, one of the brothers of the King, as a slanderer:—come forth, said he, "THOU SLANDERER;" a denunciation the more severe, from the sarcastic strain in which it was uttered, and the turn of the speaker's eye towards the object of his incensed eloquence. Even after the whole trial had ended, Sir Francis Burdett, just then out of prison for one libel, proclaimed aloud to his constituents, and had it published in all the papers, that the Ministers ALL DESERVED TO BE HANGED! This tem-

pest of abuse, incessantly directed against the King and all who stood by him, was borne, during several months, without the slightest attempt to punish or check it. It may be said to have raged by the permission of the government; and it is too prominent a fact to be left unnoticed, that the same advocate who so fearlessly uttered the above denunciation against a Prince of the blood, was made Attorney General when that Prince of the blood succeeded to the throne; and was subsequently raised to the still higher dignity of Lord Chief Justice, where he still remains—an honor to the kingdom.

November 15. Dined yesterday at Mrs. Porter's, Upper Norton street. We had Colonel Wilkes, who, as English Governor at St. Helena, first had charge of Bonaparte; Mr. Boswell, brother to Johnson's Boswell, and a few others—gentlemen and ladies.

Colonel Wilkes told anecdotes of Bonaparte. The one which struck me most was, that a frequent pastime with him after his arrival at St. Helena, was to play blind-man's-buff with the ladies and children; and that he entered fully into the spirit of it.

Is this *the* game of the great names of the earth? Last month I heard, that the profound jurists of Britain, her statesmen and orators, her Cannings, and Scotts, played it with the Queen at Blackheath.

I now learned, and through a channel equally authentic, that Napoleon was addicted to it!

In connexion with this personal anecdote of him from such a source, I am led to relate what I heard Baron Just say, at a subsequent day, when dining with him in Portman street. The Baron was minister from the King of Saxony at Napoleon's Court, saw him often, and, on two occasions, had special audiences which lasted an hour each. And I had occasion to remark, said he, 1st, that he was not hurried in conversation; but composed and master of himself. 2d, That his manner, instead of overawing, was so remarkably calculated to put you at ease, that "I was forced to recollect myself," said the venerable diplomat, "after being some time in his presence, lest things might fall from me not proper to be said, in consequence of feeling myself so entirely at ease." On my remarking that these attributes had not generally been ascribed to him, he replied, that, by his experience on both occasions, they were, nevertheless, strikingly observable. He then added, that he once saw him in anger, and that he never had beheld an eye and countenance so fierce. It was on the occasion of his marriage to the Empress Maria Louisa, (the Baron being at the ceremony;) and his anger was produced by perceiving that some of the princesses of his family, who were to act as trainbearers, were not in their places;

and that certain chairs assigned for some cardinals, were vacant, and the cardinals not there. Here again what have we? The "greatest man of ten centuries," as Lord Holland once called him in the House of Lords, and the man who was collected in the field of battle in proportion as danger thickened, and who could be himself under the most complicated difficulties of civil government, is fired with anger at breaches of personal etiquette!

November 17. Dined at the French Ambassador's, Portland-Place, his domicil being removed to town. We had the Diplomatic Corps; also the Duke of Wellington, the Earl of Liverpool, the Earl of Westmoreland, the Earl of Mansfield, Lord Melville, and other gentlemen.

I had much conversation with ********, of the diplomatic corps. He said, that he did not anticipate any great results from the deliberations at Troppeau; the Emperor Alexander had been educated in liberal principles, and still had them in his head—whether in his heart or not, he could not say; his Minister, Capo' Distria, was very able; his other Minister for Foreign Affairs, Count Nesselrode, not so able, perhaps, and less liberal in his principles; both would be with him at Troppeau; the Emperor of Austria would be attended by Prince Metternich, who "hated all constitutions," he said, and the

Emperor Alexander "had no love for him;" the King of Prussia would be attended by the Prince Royal; also by Prince Hardenburg, and M. de Bernstoff—the two latter being in the interest of Austria. England would be represented only by Lord Stewart, English Ambassador at Vienna. He also told me, that Russia had obtained a loan of forty millions of rubles from the Barings and Hope, and that Austria had got a small one from Rothschild, but none whatever from the British Government, or under its guarantee; adding his belief, that the British Government had refused, either to lend or guarantee, as the object of the loan connected itself with meditated hostilities by Austria against Naples.

At table, I had Lord Mansfield next to me. He stands next but one, in that title, to Lord Chief Justice Mansfield, who has so much fame with the bar and bench in the United States, as well as England, having succeeded to the title as his great nephew. I asked, if the destruction of the Lord Chief Justice's papers had been entire, in the attack upon his house in Bloomsbury Square, during the riots of Lord George Gordon. He said, yes—nothing had been saved. I then referred to Bissett's account of that transaction, in his history of George III., recalling the incident of the Chief Justice having found refuge with the Royal Family, at Buckingham House, for the first few days after the burning

of his own, where the Queen had been so charmed with his conversation. His lordship, smiling, said, that the incident, however prettily related, as far as he was informed, had never happened!

Some fine Burgundy circulating round the table, it was said to be the product of a vineyard in France, eight hundred years old.

November 22. Dined at Mr. Coutts Trotter's, at his villa, Bransbury, three miles from town, where we had Lord Erskine, Sir Edmund Antrobus, Mr. Planta, Captain Lindsay, and the ladies of Mr. Trotter's family, my wife being also of the party. Lord Erskine did us the favor to take a seat in our carriage.

On the way out, he was full of sprightliness. Always straight-forward and powerful at the bar and in Parliament, this distinguished Peer indulges in eccentricities in conversation. "*England*," said he, "*is a blackguard country.*" "A great country," I I replied. "*Yes*," said he, "*a great blackguard country; a boxing, fighting, country, and don't you call that blackguard?*" I said that he jumped to his conclusions, faster than I could follow. "*Aye*," said he, "*you are accredited to the King; but for all that, the King has been constantly fighting with Providence; Providence gave him high endowments, with a fine person, and had been trying to make him the head of a*

great and glorious people; but the King had been for ever battling it with him, and at the end of about the thirteenth round, with the advantage of good bottle holders, he had now fairly beaten Providence off the ground." Here he was alluding to the case of the Queen, whose cause he had defended stoutly. Continuing this lively strain, his lordship went on to say, that he had received many letters from the King in the course of his life, and that nothing would now gratify him so much as an audience of half an hour with his Majesty, provided he would suffer him to talk to him as he formerly did—as a friend; otherwise, he would make his bow after the first salutation; but he humbly thought he could render him so popular, that he might dismiss his royal stud of horses and trust to his people in all parts of the kingdom, to draw his carriages wherever he wanted to go.

When we got to Mr. Trotter's, his lordship kept up his sprightly vein at table. He gave us an account of his country seat at Hampstead, where Burke used to visit him. "I believe," said Mr. Trotter, "the soil is not the best in that part of Hampstead where your seat is." "No, very bad," he replied, "for although my grandfather was buried there an Earl near a hundred years ago, what has sprouted up from it since but a baron." He alluded to his own title. He mentioned a fact, however, going to show, that although the soil yielded no in-

crease in titles of nobility, it did in other things; for in his description, he referred to a chestnut tree upon it, which, when he first went to live there, his gardener bought at a nursery garden for six pence, and that it now yielded him thirty pounds a year. Conversation like this, and more from him on other subjects, was intermingled with good contributions from the rest of the company. His lordship returned with us in our carriage, with no diminution of his sprightliness.

November 23. Parliament was prorogued until the 23d of January. An unusual scene was witnessed in the House of Commons. The Queen having applied to the ministry for a palace to reside in, since the bill of pains and penalties against her was withdrawn, and her application being refused, on the ground that it rested with Parliament to provide an establishment of that kind, Mr. Denman, as one of her counsel, and also a member of the House, rose and endeavored to read a message from Her Majesty, before the usual forms of prorogation were gone through; but he could obtain no hearing. Uproar and confusion followed, making it difficult to get through the forms. The prorogation, however, was, in the end, duly effected. The fact of her sending a message to the House, may be considered as in character with the speech she was said to have made,

after the bill against her had passed to a second reading. Her counsel drew a protest against it, which was taken to her to sign. This she did, with a hearty good will, exclaiming, as she threw down the pen, "There, *Regina still,* in spite of them."

November 25. Dine at Mr. Thornhill's, Bloomsbury Square, a director of the East India Company. It was mentioned at table, that on the estate of a gentleman in Glamorganshire, orange trees are growing which were brought over to England in the Spanish Armada. The Spaniards confidently expecting to conquer England, had prepared themselves to stock it with all manner of good things; which may go to the account of the Spanish side of the argument about the Armada, at the dinner at Lord Lansdowne's.

December 7. The diplomatic corps, consisting of all the Ministers Plenipotentiary in town and their ladies, dine with us.

We talked of the deliberations at Troppeau. ****** said, that the King of Naples had been invited to meet the Allied Sovereigns in person, at Layback, and that his refusal to go would be construed into not being free within his own dominions, and probably lead to an invasion of Naples by an Austrian force. The King's dilemma, he remarked,

was very embarrassing. The Allied Sovereigns summoned him to their presence under threats; whilst the Constitutional party and Carbonari of his own country would restrain his departure. He did not know if England and France had protested against an attack on Naples; his impression was, that in the present disturbed state of Italy, England would observe a neutral policy.

December 13. Dined at the French Ambassador's. We had all the Ambassadors and Ministers, with their ladies; Lord Castlereagh, Lord Fitzroy Somerset, Mr. de Neuman, Mr. Chinnery, and other gentlemen.

The Duke de Frias, Spanish Ambassador, told me that the Allied Sovereigns had "sent a summons" for him, adding that if he did not obey, he supposed they intended to send an Austrian army to look after him! He said that by the Spanish Constitution, the King could not leave his kingdom, without the consent of the Cortes; if he did, it amounted, ipso facto, to an abandonment of his throne. He spoke of the Constitution of the United States, particularly of our Senate, which he called "the intermediate body." You have none such in Spain, I remarked, and are therefore more democratic; we prefer two chambers. "It is true," said he, "we have but one; and (pointing to the star

which he wore) "though with this on, I cannot find fault, I think the want of an intermediate body, a defect in the Spanish Constitution."

Before going to dinner, Lord Castlereagh addressed me with great cordiality, saying as he came up, "Why, I have not seen you these hundred years!" "My misfortune, my lord," I replied. "It is a proof," said he, "how smooth the waters are between our two countries." "Then," said I, "we must contrive to ruffle them a little, if their smoothness is to be followed by our constant separation!" "No, no," said he, "that won't do." More passed in the same strain, the by-standers of the diplomatic corps seeming to relish this friendly international and personal tone between us.

Let me here give brief expression to a feeling I often had during my mission; one which is common, I suppose, to every Minister of the United States abroad. It is, his feeling of entire independence of the combinations and movements going on among the other powers. Properly improved, this makes his personal situation agreeable, as well with the court where he may be residing, as with the entire diplomatic corps. For his country, he has only to be just and fear not. The smaller Powers cannot have this calm assurance; and the representatives of the Great Powers naturally respect the office of American Minister, from a knowledge of the re-

sources, and growing power of the nation that sends him; and also (some of them) from dreaming of contingencies which may make the friendship of the United States desirable, though their maxim be, "peace and commerce with all nations, entangling alliances with none." One of the members of the corps who witnessed the salutations passing between Lord Castlereagh and myself, said to me a few minutes afterwards, "How happy you must feel in these times when none of us know what is to happen in Europe—you belong to us, (meaning the corps,) yet are independent."

His lordship asked me if Mr. Planta had shown me the letters from Sir Henry Wellesley respecting the ratification of our treaty at Madrid. I said, not yet. He replied that he had requested him to do so, and would remind him of it.

I then spoke to him about the boundary line under the fifth article of the Treaty of Ghent, asking him if I could be furnished with certain documents, the general nature of which I explained; but as he was not at the moment familiar with them, it was agreed that I should write him an official note on the subject.

December 20. The following letter to Mr. Crawford, Secretary of the Treasury at Washington, be-

longing to topics lately engaging attention in the mission, is inserted in connexion with them.

LONDON, *December* 20, 1820.

DEAR SIR,

It is time that I wrote again to you, and I feel my delinquency; but the many calls upon the time of an American minister in London, sometimes make it difficult to keep them all under.

There seems a stagnation of public excitement here at the present moment, the case of the Queen being at an end. Of foreign politics, you are probably in the way of hearing more through our ministers at the several European capitals, than I can write you from this single one. All eyes turn towards Italy. I believe it to be certain, that the Allied Sovereigns before leaving Troppeau, determined that the King of Naples should be summoned to meet them at some place out of his dominions. Should he not obey, they will say that his people restrain him, and that he is not free in his own states. Should he go, his people will say that he is ruled by foreigners.

What part will England act, should there be war? This is the question which concerns the United States. Ask her manufacturers at this juncture, and all the operatives who depend upon them, if they would not like war? most of them would answer yes—if you push them. Ask her merchants, and

all who depend upon them? you would not get an answer very different. Ask her army, ask her navy, and all dovetailed in with these great establishments? the answers come by instinct. You have already half the nation; and of those that remain, thousands would join the war chorus. What will follow? I should say this: She will remain neutral for awhile, draw up an able state paper or two, full of generalities against war, such as all state papers contain; but be getting ready, (though she is always ready,) to take a hand in it. The vocation of a prophet is dangerous; but were I to prophesy at all, it would be much after the above fashion—should war really break out from the present revolutionary materials in Italy and Spain.

But ask her *treasury* you will say? I will answer that too. She has borne once, and could again, the property tax. This would pay the interest on a new debt of three hundred millions. She could borrow that, and more, from her own people whenever she chooses. But what would she do when her debt was thus increased, as she could scarcely pay the interest of it, and war expenses, and all other expenses, in addition, without further loans? I do not know. She will settle that when the time arrives. War, with all its general havoc, is apt to open the way to new profits and monopolies to Britain, from her sway on the ocean, and her insular situation,

which keeps war from her own borders. She is a gigantic power, and has gigantic resources, many of them still undrawn upon. I cannot see how she is to wind up, without a financial convulsion in some way; but although the difference in figures would be double if her debt were to be increased to sixteen hundred millions sterling by a new war, she would not estimate in the same ratio an increase of her dangers. She cannot pay off the capital of eight hundred millions, nor do her creditors wish it; and this is all you could say of sixteen hundred millions, should her debt get up to that mark. Should she lower the interest, it would only be doing what she has done before, and she might be able to get the consent of her creditors.

Notwithstanding the failure of the bill of pains and penalties, I anticipate no change in the Ministry. Where would successors be found? The Whigs have lost their strong ground, the Reformers having taken it from under them. They are a party of leaders, with no rank and file, fine accomplished men, but as aristocratic as the tories; the descendants of the party which converted parliaments from three years into seven; in fact, the party more inclined at present, openly to impeach popular principles, at least those of our government, than the tories, lest they should be suspected of republicanism. The Tories, having no such fear, can afford to

treat us better. Besides, the King does not wish a change of Ministers, as is well understood. If he consulted the public voice out of doors, it would be hard to say where he could get ministers more popular (counting nothing but numbers,) than those he has; unless he went among the Reformers. There is no King of England will ever do this, voluntarily. Popular government suits us for a thousand reasons, but might prove a very different thing in England.

I bid you adieu my dear Sir, with assurances of the respect and esteem with which I am

Your faithful
friend and servant,
RICHARD RUSH.

The Honorable
WM. H. CRAWFORD,
Secretary of the Treasury.

December 23. In connexion with the Report on the Foreign trade of England, made by a select committee of the House of Commons during the last session of Parliament, which I transmitted to the Secretary of State, I this day send a dispatch to the department on the commercial laws and regulations of the kingdom; a subject very complex and entangled, as the existence of full ELEVEN HUNDRED

laws, ancient and modern, in the statute book in relation to it, may sufficiently attest.

December 28. Had an interview with Lord Castlereagh, at the Foreign office, sought on my part for the purpose of arranging further preliminaries, with a view to the umpirage of the Emperor of Russia, on the question under the Treaty of Ghent.

That business gone through, his lordship referred to the Florida Treaty in connexion with the correspondence of Sir Henry Wellesley, of which he had spoken at the French Ambassador's. Mr. Planta having shown me the correspondence, his lordship said that copies of the letters would be at my service, if I had any inclination for them. I said that they would be very acceptable, and was accordingly supplied with them. In making me acquainted with this correspondence, he remarked, that he did not do it in the shape of an official communication, but merely as connected with all our former conversations on the subject, now brought to a conclusion.

The correspondence consisted of an official letter from Evaristo Perez de Castro, Minister of State to the King of Spain, to Sir Henry Wellesley, British Ambassador at Madrid, and the Ambassador's answer. I subjoin a copy of each:

PALACE, *October* 16, 1820.

SIR,

The Cortes of the Kingdom having authorized His Majesty to cede the Floridas to the United States as is stipulated in one of the articles of the treaty entered into between Spain and that Power on the twenty-second of February, 1819, the King has determined to proceed to the ratification of that treaty, which, as yet, has not been carried into effect on his part.

His Majesty in commanding me to communicate to your Excellency his resolution upon this point for the information of your Government, is persuaded that his Britannic Majesty, who is aware of the principal events of that long and important negotiation, will not fail to see with pleasure that the speedy ratification of that treaty, will put an end to the differences which existed between the two nations, and will insure to Spain those relations of friendship and harmony which she is anxious to maintain with the government of the United States.

Signed,

EVARISTO PEREZ DE CASTRO.

The Ambassador's Answer.

The undersigned, &c. &c., requests his Excellency the Minister of State, to accept his acknowledgments for the note which he has done him the honor to address to him, apprizing him of His Catho-

lic Majesty's intention to proceed forthwith to the ratification of the treaty with the government of the United States, by an article of which the Floridas are ceded.

At the commencement of the negotiations which have led to this treaty, His Britannic Majesty, in his zeal for the interests of his Ally, and laying aside every consideration as to what might be most conducive to his own interests, announced to His Catholic Majesty his resolution not to oppose any arrangement which was calculated to put an end to the differences between Spain and the United States, and to establish their future relations upon an amicable footing.

To this resolution His Majesty's government has invariably adhered.

The undersigned is therefore persuaded that the communication which His Excellency the Minister of State has enabled him to make to his government, will be received by it with sentiments of the highest satisfaction.

The undersigned avails himself of this opportunity, &c. &c. &c.

Signed,

H. WELLESLEY.

MADRID, *October* 17, 1820.

It was with great satisfaction, that I transmitted

to my Government the foregoing correspondence, confirming, as it did, Lord Castlereagh's uniform declarations to me on this subject, from the evening I first informally opened it to him, when we met at the Prince Regent's entertainment at Carlton House.

December 31. Passed last evening at Prince Esterhazy's. The Secretary of the French Embassy, who was there, gave me to understand, that there was no foundation for the newspaper assertions of a treaty of commerce being on foot between France and England, though made so confidently. In conversation with the Prince, he spoke of the members of the Austrian Imperial family, saying that they were characterized by unostentatious habits and private worth. He spoke chiefly of the Emperor; said that his palaces, for the most part, were plain, and furnished with simplicity; that all persons could have access to him who wished it—scarcely were the humblest excluded; there was no previous scrutiny into their pretensions, and only very slight previous forms necessary. He ascribed all this to the Emperor's disposition, which he represented as very mild and paternal. We spoke of European politics, and the deliberations at Troppeau. I asked whether, in case of a campaign in Italy, the Arch-

duke Charles would be likely to take the field. He said that he did not know, but that his health was better than for the last ten years, adding that it was understood he was engaged in drawing up the memoirs of his military life, and in carrying still further his studies upon the art of war.

CHAPTER XIX.

PARTY AT THE RUSSIAN AMBASSADOR'S—CERTAIN DUTIES OF BRITISH AMBASSADORS AND MINISTERS—LANGUAGE OF OFFICIAL DIPLOMATIC NOTES. LEVEE AT CARLTON PALACE—SPECIAL AUDIENCE OF THE KING TO DELIVER AUTOGRAPH LETTERS FROM THE PRESIDENT, ON THE DEATH OF THE DUCHESS OF YORK, AND RECALL OF SIR CHARLES BAGOT FROM HIS MISSION TO WASHINGTON. THE CORONATION. DINNER AT THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY'S, (LATE LORD CASTLEREAGH.) FETE CHAMPETRE AT NORTH CRAY, GIVEN BY THE MARCHIONESS OF LONDONDERRY IN HONOR OF THE CORONATION. DINNER AT THE KING'S. THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON GIVES A DINNER IN HONOR OF THE CORONATION, AT WHICH THE KING IS HIS GUEST. BALL GIVEN BY THE DUKE DE GRAMMONT, SPECIAL AMBASSADOR FROM FRANCE, IN HONOR OF THE CORONATION, WHICH THE KING ATTENDS.

1821. *January* 4. Last night I was at the Russian Ambassador's. Mr. Planta was there, and we

had conversation on the customs of this and other governments, in regard to Foreign Ministers. He said that their's, (the British,) had instructions to write a dispatch, under all ordinary circumstances, at least once a fortnight; but that this number was apt to be much exceeded in point of fact. He said, also, that they were instructed to make a separate dispatch, as far as possible, of every separate piece of business, and that this often made the number received very great; as, for example, from their Ambassador in Paris, from whom they received every mail-day, which recurred twice a week, two or three dispatches—seldom fewer—he should think it not improbable, that full three hundred had been received during the year just ended. In numbering their dispatches, their Ambassadors and Ministers began afresh, with every new year; and it was also made their duty to number the dispatches on the outside, as well as to indorse upon them a short abstract of the subject. They thus arrived ready for the files of the Foreign Office, after being read, and in a state to be conveniently referred to when wanted.

In answer to my inquiries as to the language employed in diplomatic notes in London, he said, that this government was now pushing the English language more than at any former period. Sir Henry Wellesley, at Madrid, for instance, addressed the

Spanish government in English; in retaliation of which the Spanish Ambassador in London, addressed his notes to Lord Castlereagh in Spanish. The Ambassadors and Ministers of all the other powers, he said, the United States excepted, (courteously alluding to the community of the English tongue between us,) wrote to Lord Castlereagh in French; but that the answers were uniformly in English. Formerly the answers had been generally in French. It was Lord Grenville, who, whilst Secretary for Foreign Affairs, first broke in upon the use of French.

January 26. Attended the levee at Carlton Palace, and had a special audience of the King for the purpose of presenting two autograph letters from the President, in reply to two from the King; one announcing the death of the Duchess of York, the other relating to the recall of Sir Charles Bagot from his mission to Washington. In delivering the former, I said that I was instructed to express the sincere concern which the President always felt in any event which affected personally the happiness of His Majesty, or any of the Royal Family; and that in delivering the latter, I was specially directed to make known the entire satisfaction which the conduct of Sir Charles Bagot had given to my government, during his residence in the United States;

and also the satisfaction with which the President had received from his successor, assurances of the continuation of His Majesty's good will towards the United States.

On the latter head, the King replied in expressions, and with a manner, of more than usual cordiality and earnestness. He said, that it was his most sincere and anxious desire to see harmony kept up between the two nations; that he rejoiced at its entire existence at the present time, and could give me the fullest assurances that nothing should be wanting on his part, to render it permanent, for which there were the strongest motives on both sides. He added, (for I am bound to give his words as his Minister heard them, and they were known to his Cabinet,) that my conduct had been always in the spirit of conciliation, since I had been at his Court; and that there were occasions when the exercise of such a spirit had been useful, and acceptable to this government. He remarked further, that he would not rest content with directing his Minister (turning to Lord Castlereagh who stood by him) to tell me so, but was happy to take this opportunity of saying so to me in person.

I answered, that I felt honored by His Majesty's words; that I well knew that I should not earn His Majesty's respect, unless I consulted, primarily, the interests of my own country; but that, in doing so,

it was the first wish of my heart to be instrumental towards maintaining harmony between the two nations; and if my duty had been discharged in a manner to be acceptable to His Majesty, it was a source of high satisfaction to me. The audience here closed.

I saw Lord Castlereagh before the levee was over. He alluded to what had passed at the audience; on which I expressed anew the satisfaction it had afforded me, feeling sure that his lordship had prepared the way for what the King said.

July 20. Yesterday the Coronation was celebrated in all pomp. For two or three days preceding, princes, legislators, statesmen, bishops, philosophers, warriors, the young and old, grave and gay, tory and whig, nobleman and commoner, rich and poor, seem all, more or less, to have been talking about it. The Potentates of Europe sent over their special Ambassadors in honor of it. France hers, in the person of the Duke de Grammont; Russia hers, in Count Stackelberg; Austria hers, in the elder Prince Esterhazy; Prussia hers, in Prince Hatzfeldt—all arriving with their retinues; and the smaller powers doing reverence to the occasion in the same way, though on a reduced scale of representation. All this may incite the representative of the United

States to a few words, on the general subject, whilst making a minute of the connexion he had with it.

The first notice of it that came to me in an official form, was in the shape of a note from Sir Robert Chester, the Master of Ceremonies, dated the fifteenth of June. This informed me that the Coronation was to take place on the nineteenth of July, and that a space would be allotted in Westminster Hall and Westminster Abbey for the accommodation of the Foreign Ministers and their families, and a portion of the strangers belonging to their respective courts, who might happen to be in town and had been previously presented to the King; and I was requested to make an early return of the individuals of my family, and of my "Court," to whom I considered it proper that invitations should be sent. To this note I replied in due form.

The further notices which I received from the same source as the time drew near, consisted of six different papers, as follow: 1. A paper on which were laid down the routes and streets which all carriages were to take in conveying persons to and from the Hall and Abbey. These were settled by the Privy Council as the paper stated, which was signed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department. 2. An engraved map of the whole course. 3. Instructions signed by the Master of Ceremonies in regard to dress. 4. My tickets of admission to

the Hall, signed by Lord Gwyder, as Deputy Lord Great Chamberlain. 5. Similar tickets of admission to the Abbey, signed by Lord Howard of Effingham, who acted for the Duke of Norfolk as Earl Marshal of England. 6. Eight printed sheets in folio, containing a full account in detail of all the ceremonies to be witnessed in the Hall and Abbey.

So prepared, I set out with my suite at six in the morning. After various perils to my carriage, we reached Westminster Hall at about eight; for it took us that length of time to arrive, although the distance was not more than three miles from my residence. The route for the Foreign Ambassadors and Ministers, was down Grosvenor Place, along Milbank, through Abingdon street, and in that way to the House of Lords. We should not have arrived so soon, but that the carriage of the Austrian Ambassador, Prince Esterhazy, which headed our line, manœuvred bravely; the throng of carriages being so great at some points, that it became impossible to keep the exact order laid down. The morning was fine, which made the equipages and troops a brilliant sight. Even at that early hour, windows and front doors were crowded with people, looking at the carriages of the ambassadors and nobility with richly dressed persons inside, as they passed in procession to the great pageant of the day.

The box prepared for the Foreign Ambassadors

and Ministers, was at the south end of the Hall, immediately opposite the one fitted up for the Royal Family. It bordered upon the royal platform and was near the Throne. When we entered, the hall was already filled with Peers, Peeresses, their daughters, and others, all in rich array. Heralds at arms were engaged in quietly arranging the various personages among the nobility, and others, who were to move in the procession from the Hall to the Abbey. Suddenly, there was a pause and perfect stillness. This betokened the entrance of the King, who came into the Hall at about ten o'clock in full state. All in the galleries rose, and continued to stand up. When the King was seated, he turned first towards the box of the Royal Family, and bowed; then did the same towards that in which were the Foreign Ambassadors and Ministers. I cannot attempt to describe the ceremonies which passed after the King came in, until the procession moved, they were so numerous. Of the successive groups who made reverences before him previously to descending the steps of the royal platform to assume their places in the grand procession, the Royal Dukes, Prince Leopold, and the Marquis of Londonderry, were especially observable, by the parts and costumes assigned to them. Some of these wore robes, and a hat looped up with the black heron feather, whilst others had white plumes.

In an hour or less the procession began to move through the street, which, by a space here opening wide, leads across to Westminster Abbey. The King went under a canopy of cloth of gold, borne over him with attendant pomp. But the part of the procession which seemed most regarded by many, was Miss Fellowes, the herb woman, dressed in white; who, with her six young ladies in attendance, strewed flowers along the raised way of the procession, as the Royal Canopy and train were moving from the Hall to the Abbey. It took some time to reach the Abbey, so slow was the movement. The streets, windows, house-tops, chimney-tops, were filled with people gazing at it. It was the only part of the ceremonial exhibited out of doors, and was very gorgeous.

The Diplomatic Corps, including the special Ambassadors and their suite, went from the House of Lords to the Abbey, through a covered passage hung with crimson, which had been prepared for the Royal Family, the Corps, and the Peeresses, and was erected entirely across the street. In the Abbey, we found our accommodations such as they had been in the Hall, an ample box opposite to that of the Royal Family. In the Abbey it was, that the actual crowning took place; but not until various other ceremonies, solemn in tone, had been performed. A sermon was preached by the Archbishop of York;

text, "He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God." Of the religious and state ceremonies, the coronation oath was most important. It was, as lawyers might say, the *gist* of the whole case, marking the transmission of the English throne to a new monarch. The King took it with much solemnity, kissed the book, and signed the oath. Its purport was, that he would govern the realm according to the laws of Parliament, cause justice to be executed in mercy, and maintain the Protestant religion as established by law. The Archbishop of Canterbury administered the oath and put the crown on. Then followed the homage and other ceremonies, amongst which was that of each Peer putting on his coronet at a given moment; a movement done simultaneously with military exactness and effect. It took us by surprise, seeming like a hundred coronations all at once.

The Marquis of Anglesey, as Lord High Steward, carried the crown up to the altar, before the Archbishop placed it on the King's head. It was heavy with diamonds and other precious stones, and slipped from his hands; but the gallant Marquis, though with but one leg to stand upon, having lost the other at Waterloo, dexterously recovered it, so that it did not fall.

The state and religious ceremonies in the Abbey, which took up a long time, being finished, the King

and whole assemblage returned to the Hall. There, the scene assumed a new character. There, it had its chief splendor. It became in a high degree picturesque and animating. Whilst all were absent in the Abbey, the banquet was preparing in the Hall. The King was yet to dine in presence of his nobility and other subjects, and all his coronation guests; and all these were also to dine. The table for the King's banquet, was spread on the royal platform. The Foreign Ambassadors and Ministers had theirs in the painted chamber of the House of Lords, a communicating apartment under the same roof; but we rose from it soon to come into the Hall—the centre of all attraction. The Peeresses, Peers, and others associated with them, had their banquet in the body of the Hall. Here, six long tables were laid, three on each side, leaving a vista, or aisle, open in the middle, which directly faced the royal platform. The platform and all the seats were covered with crimson; which, with the Peeresses richly dressed, and the plate on the banqueting tables, and the company all seated, with the King at the head of his table, shaped as a crescent, so that he and the few seated on his right and left faced the whole company, made the spectacle extremely magnificent. The comptroller and clerks of the kitchen, and purveyor of wines, had not, as may be imagined, overlooked their duties! But when the CHAMPION ap-

peared at the opposite extremity of the Hall, directly in front of the King, nothing seen at first but tufts of luxuriant plumes waving from his horse's head, and his own helmet, startling emotions arose. Curiosity was breathless to see the development of what was coming. He was attended by Howard of Effingham; and by Anglesey; and by another greater than all, THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON; and as these, all on horseback, now entered abreast, the champion heralding his challenge, and the horses seeming almost in contact with the outward line of Peeresses at their banqueting table, yet obedient to the bit, which they kept champing; as this equestrian train slowly advanced, in martial grace and strength, up the aisle towards the King, all eyes were soon turned upon one person in it. In vain did the sun, through the vast old Gothic edifice, throw beams upon the bright and heavy armor of the champion; in vain—when the horses, reaching by slow, impatient, steps the top of the aisle, and proudly halting at the steps of the royal platform—that the steel-clad champion again put forth his challenge, threw down his glove, received the cup from his Sovereign, and drank to his Sovereign:—in vain all this: the beauty and chivalry at the banqueting tables, still looked at the DUKE OF WELLINGTON; still kept their eyes on the man whose person and horse recalled, not war in romance, but in its stern and recent realities. All

were at gaze upon him; fixed, silent. He was habited only as a Peer; had only his staff as Lord High Constable; yet was he the observed of all. Nowhere was he more eyed, than from the box where sat the assembled Ambassadors of the Potentates of Europe. Judging from opinion in that box, there was nothing in the elaborate grandeur of the day to rival this scene. It was the inherent preeminence of a great man, exalting moral admiration above the show of a whole kingdom.*

I got home from it all by nine o'clock in the evening. Many were detained until midnight. An illumination followed. In divers parts of the town, fireworks were let off, balloons sent up, cannon made to roar, bells to ring, the theatres were opened gratis, and the whole night went off amidst the general huzzas of John Bull.

In due time, Sir Robert Chester waited upon me with a coronation medal, of which he asked my acceptance. It was of gold, with a bust of the King

* "The Champion," was Mr. Dymoke, who claimed that office by hereditary right from an age long back. The following were the words of his challenge: "If any person, of what degree soever, high or low, shall deny or gainsay our Sovereign Lord King George the Fourth, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, son and next heir to our Sovereign Lord King George the Third, the last King, deceased, to be right heir to the imperial crown of this United Kingdom, or that he ought not to enjoy the same, here is his Champion, who saith that he lieth, and is a false traitor; being ready in person to combat with him, and in this quarrel will adventure his life against him on what day soever he shall be appointed."

on one side, and on the other several emblematical representations, including Britannia with Neptune's trident. One of these medals, he said, was due by ancient custom to every Minister Plenipotentiary at the English Court when the King was crowned; he was distributing them, and was happy to hand me mine. I declined it, with expressions of respect towards His Majesty proper to be used, and under every sensibility to the honor of being invited to his coronation; but alleged that the Constitution of the United States prohibited their Foreign Ministers receiving a present from any Foreign Prince or Potentate. Sir Robert, with his usual courtesy, then tendered it to Mrs. Rush, saying that our Constitution surely did not mention the ladies! But here I was driven to quote the old common law upon him, which was part of our inheritance in the United States, and a good inheritance we thought it, though it did, ungallantly, make the wife's gold the husband's; so that it ended in our losing the medal both ways. These medals had been showered about the Abbey according to usage, when the coronation was over, just before we returned to the kingly festivities of the hall; festivities which, truth to say, recalled something of the *field of gold cloth* of the time of the Tudors, and images of splendor from tournaments of the Plantagenets.

July 21. Dined at the Marquis of Londonderry's, late Lord Castlereagh, who has succeeded to the title of his father, the late Marquis of Londonderry, who died in April. We had all the special Ambassadors; also the resident corps, the Duke of Wellington, Lord Burghersh, Sir Henry Wellesley, Lord Clanwilliam, Count Metternich, and General Count Woronzoff, who commanded the Russian army of occupation in France. My seat at table was next to Count Woronzoff, and I was favored with much of his conversation.

July 23. Went to the Marchioness of Londonderry's fête champêtre, at North Cray, given in honor of the coronation. All the special Ambassadors with their suite, were there; also the Cabinet Ministers, the resident Ambassadors and Ministers, with groups of the nobility and others. The company were received on the lawn, where ornamental tents were pitched, and three bands of music stationed. The effect was heightened by the appearance, at a little distance off, of the surrounding villagers and country people, who had assembled as lookers-on beyond the line of invisible fences and rural barriers, which skirted the lawn. But this rural scene, like many other enchantments, was destined soon to vanish; for alas, showers came on which drove us under the tents and into the man-

sion. At about five o'clock, we sat down in the latter to a déjûné a la fourchette, and got back to town a little after night-fall, the road alive with the gay equipages of such a company.

July 25. Attend the levee. The rooms are thronged, under excitements in the gay world of London, from the coronation.

July 26. Dined at the King's. The dinner was given to the Special Ambassadors, sent by their respective sovereigns to do honor to the Coronation, and to all the resident Diplomatic Corps, Ambassadors and Ministers; but included none below the rank of Minister Plenipotentiary. Of the Royal Dukes, there were present the Duke of York, Duke of Clarence and Duke of Cambridge. The additional guests, were the Duke of Wellington, the Duke of Montrose, the Marquis of Londonderry, and Lord Francis Conyngham.

We were invited at seven o'clock. As my carriage turned into Pall Mall from the foot of St. James's street, the old clock at St. James' struck seven; and before I reached Carlton Palace, all the carriages appeared to be entering or coming out through the double gates in front of the Palace. Mine was among the last that drove up to the portico, and by a very few minutes past seven, all the

guests, save one, were assembled in the reception rooms. I had never before witnessed such punctuality at any dinner in England.

The King entered a minute or two afterwards, and saluted his guests generally; then went the rounds, speaking to each individually. With the special Ambassadors, he paused longest. Time had now run on to more than a quarter past seven. Still, one of the guests had not yet arrived, and that one was the Duke of Wellington. Five minutes more went by, and still no Duke of Wellington appeared; critical moments, when each one seemed to count two! At length, in one of the rooms, at a distance, the Duke was seen coming. He was dressed in the uniform of an Austrian Field Marshal, a plain roundabout jacket of white cloth, and white under dress to suit, relieved by scarcely any thing but his sword. His dress being tight and simple, gave to his person a thinner look than usual; and as he kept advancing with easy step, quite alone, and a general silence prevailing, the King, as he drew near, stepped forward to meet him. With both hands, he took the Duke by both, which he shook with great cordiality, saying something which the company could not hear, but which, from the manner, we took to be a good humored rally upon his late arrival. The Duke received it with placid composure, made no reply, but bowed. When liberated from the friendly

grasp of the King, he approached a circle of which I happened to be one. One of the ministers composing it said to him, "We hope you will forgive our little treason my Lord Duke, but we have just been determining here, that as some one of the company was to be too late, best to have fallen to your Grace's lot, who can so well bear it!" With a half whisper, and arch smile, the Duke replied, "*The King knows I would have been here sooner, but for attending to some of His Majesty's business.*" This, the Duke being a Cabinet Minister, had doubtless been sufficient to cover his delinquency, and secure for him the very cordial and kind reception all had witnessed.

Hardly had he uttered this little sentence, when dinner was announced. The King led the way; the Royal Dukes followed; then the Special Ambassadors, each taking precedence by the date of his arrival in London; then the resident Corps and rest of the company, each having the *pas* under rules well known. All were in high official costume. The King took the middle of his table; the Marquis of Londonderry one end, and Count Munster, who, as Hanoverian Minister had a sort of family rank at the English Court, the other end. In all, above thirty sat down to table. The King gave his chief attentions to those near him, who were the special Ambassadors. The ornaments down the middle of the

table, and profusion of lights, intercepted the view of the guests across it. I was next to Lord Londonderry, and had some conversation with him. It touched upon Russia and Turkey; he expressed the hope that things in that quarter would end quietly, remarking that the Emperor was moderate; it touched upon English society also, and the remark dropped from him that the higher the rank and education, the better bred, as a general rule, their people in England—so he believed it was considered. Some conversation I also had with the Duke of Clarence and the Duke of Montrose, on American steamboats, and the genius of Fulton. The former was inclined to claim Fulton as an Englishman; but I said that we could not surrender the honor of his birth for the United States.

The entire dinner service was of gold. Something struck me among the smaller pieces, as very appropriate in design—the salt-cellars. Each represented a small rock, in dead gold, on which reclined a little sea nymph holding in her hand a shell, which contained the salt. One of these was before every two guests. So it was, as to number, with the golden coolers down the sides, containing wine. The servants in the royal livery were abundant, and their quiet movements seen rather than heard. The whole table, sideboard, and room, had an air of chaste and solid grandeur; not however interfering with the

restrained enjoyments of a good dinner, of which the King seemed desirous that his foreign guests should in nowise be abridged, for we sat until past ten o'clock. When he moved, the company all rose, and, in the order in which we came to dinner, returned to the drawing-rooms, where coffee was handed. All repaired afterwards to a ball given by Princess Esterhazy in honor of the coronation, the King's carriage going first.

July 27. Dined at the Duke of Wellington's. The card of invitation mentioned that it was to meet the King, who was there accordingly.

We had all the Special Ambassadors, as yesterday, at the King's; most of the resident Ambassadors and Ministers, and the Dukes of York, Clarence, and Cambridge; also the Duke of Devonshire, the Duke of Rutland, the Duke of Beaufort, the Duke of Montrose, the Marquis of Wellesley, the Earl of Liverpool, (Premier,) the Earl of Westmoreland, Lord Maryborough, Lord Melville, and Field Marshal Lord Beresford. The whole company were in full costume, as at the King's table.

I sat next to Lord Melville, and had Lord Maryborough on the other side. The former mentioned, that the British Government had determined to publish all the admiralty charts. The latter talked of our Navy, of the equipments and discipline of which,

I found that he was not unaware. And here I will take this incidental occasion to say, that, whilst the bulk of the English scarcely know that an English ship was ever vanquished by an American, and whilst English authors have striven to prove, by arithmetic, how every battle between English and American ships attested superior merit in the English, I never heard an enlightened English gentleman, and least of all those of the higher classes, speak on the subject, (one which I never introduced,) who did not pay tributes to the skill and valor with which our ships were fought, and admit that theirs had been overcome with a rapidity and completeness, out of all proportion to the excess of force on our side, when excess existed; but they commonly added, that the size, discipline and equipment of our ships had taken them by surprise, which they said would not be likely to occur again. "A Roman myself, I am overcome by a Roman."

I return to the dinner. The table service was brilliant. It lighted up better than the King's; for, being entirely of silver, and very profuse, the whole aspect was of pure, glittering white; unlike the slightly shaded tinges which candles seem to cast from gold plate. When the desert came, there were different sets of beautiful china, one a present to the Duke from the King of France, the other from the Emperor of Austria.

The King sat on the right hand of the Duke. Just before the desert courses, the Duke gave His Majesty as a toast. The guests all rose, and drank it in silence, the King also rising and bowing to the company. A few minutes after, the King gave the Duke of Wellington, introducing his toast with a few remarks. The purport of them was, that, had it not been for the exertions of his friend upon his left, it was so that he spoke of the Duke, he, the King, might not have had the happiness of meeting those whom he now saw around him at that table; it was, therefore, with particular pleasure, that he proposed his health. The King spoke his words with emphasis, and great apparent pleasure. The Duke made no reply, but took in respectful silence what was said. The King continued sitting whilst he spoke, as did the company, in profound stillness under his words.

I thought of Johnson, when George III. complimented him. The innate dignity of great minds is the same. In Johnson, it was that of the rough virtuous, recluse—whose greatness was that of the author. In Wellington, it was externally moulded into the ease which armies, and courts, and long association with the élite of mankind, may be supposed to give. Johnson did not "bandy civilities" with his Sovereign, whom he had never seen before; nor did Wellington, who saw him every day.

The dinner over, coffee was served in the drawing rooms. At about eleven o'clock, the King, the Duke, and all the company, went to a ball at Almack's given in honor of the coronation, by the Special Ambassador from France—the Duke de Grammont; and whatever French taste, directed by a Grammont, could do to render the night agreeable, was witnessed. His suite of young gentlemen from Paris, stood ready to receive the British fair on their first approach to the rooms, and from baskets of flowers presented them with rich bouquets. Each lady thus entered the ball room with one in her hand; and a thousand bouquets displayed their hues and exhaled their sweets, as the dancing commenced.

CHAPTER XX.

DEATH OF THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY. THE FOREIGN AMBASSADORS AND MINISTERS ATTEND HIS FUNERAL. MR. CANNING BECOMES FOREIGN SECRETARY OF ENGLAND. INSTRUCTIONS FOR OPENING AN EXTENSIVE NEGOTIATION WITH ENGLAND. INTERVIEW WITH MR. CANNING ON THAT SUBJECT. CONVERSATION WITH HIM ON THE PLANS OF FRANCE AND THE EUROPEAN ALLIANCE, RESPECTING SPANISH AMERICA. RELATIONSHIP OF THE UNITED STATES TO THIS SUBJECT. DINNER AT MR. PLANTA'S—THE GAME OF TWENTY QUESTIONS.

July, 1823. The last preceding memorandum in this irregular narrative of a public mission, was in July, 1821. I cannot resume its thread, here broken by a chasm of two years, without alluding to the death of the Marquis of Londonderry, which happened in August 1822. He died by his own hand at North Cray, his country home, in Kent. The event proceeded from temporary aberration of mind, caused in all probability by his laborious exertions as ministerial leader in the House of Commons

during the session of Parliament which had just closed, added to toils and solicitudes of scarcely inferior burden upon him, as first Minister of the Crown for Foreign Affairs. His death created a great shock. As a statesman moving largely in English and European affairs during the momentous transactions which preceded and followed the overthrow of Napoleon, and influencing decidedly some of them, history has already passed upon his character; and it is no part of my purpose in these humble and fugitive pages, to discuss it in those relations. But as regards that portion of English statesmanship which has to deal with American affairs, and it is no unimportant portion, I must appeal to the preceding pages to attest the candid and liberal spirit in which he was ever disposed to view them. Let those who would doubt it, consult the archives of the two nations since the end of our revolutionary war and point out the British statesman of any class or party who, up to the period of his death, made more advances, or did more in fact, towards placing their relations upon an amicable footing. I even hazarded the opinion in Chapter XX. of the former volume of this work, that had he not left England to attend the Congress at Aix la Chapelle in 1818, he would have settled with the United States, in the negotiation then pending, the question of impressment; and, as an opinion, I still hold it

on grounds then intimated. His sentiments were all of a lofty kind. His private life was pure, and all who knew him in those relations loved him. In society, he was attractive in the highest degree; the firmness and courage of his nature, being not more remarkable than the gentleness and suavity of his manners. He was buried in Westminster Abbey, between the graves of Pitt and Fox. The Diplomatic Corps all went to his funeral; and not one among them could gaze upon his pall, without having his memory filled with recollections of kindnesses received from him. If any thing intrinsically unpleasant ever arose in the transaction of international business with them, he threw around it every mitigation which blandness of manner could impart; whilst to announce or promote what was agreeable, seemed always to give him pleasure. His personal attentions to them, were shown in ways which seemed to put out of view their coming from an official source, so unconstrained and friendly did they ever appear. Might not each individual of the large assemblage of Ambassadors and Ministers who were of the funeral train, naturally have felt grief at the death of such a Foreign Secretary? struck down, as he also was, by so melancholy a fate, in the midst of his high employments, and with apparently so strong a hold upon life and its honors? Nor did I ever see manly sorrow more written upon any countenance

than that of the Duke of Wellington, as he took a last look at the coffin when lowered into the vault.

Upon the death of Lord Londonderry, the office of Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in England passed to the hands of Mr. Canning—a name also known to fame—a statesman and an orator; filling each sphere with powers highly disciplined, whether their exercise was felt on great occasions, or only dazzled on lighter ones. He was equally the ornament of private life, in a society refined by age, by education, and by wealth; ascendant in the highest literary circles, and adding dignity to those of rank. His rural residence was at Gloucester Lodge; and his classic dinners at that abode, as the hospitalities of Lord Londonderry at North Cray and St. James's Square, will long be remembered by the Diplomatic Corps at the English Court in the time of George IV. as reliefs along the often anxious path of international business. He too, soon passed away. Raised by his genius to the Premiership, the proud dream, it may be, of his life, he died almost immediately after ascending to that pinnacle; the victim, in his turn, of official labours too intense when superadded to those of that stormy ocean where his sway was great—the House of Commons. Britain entombed him also, side by side

with those of her distinguished men whose lives were devoted to her service and renown.

During the interval of two years and more which I have passed over, having omitted almost entirely also the first six months of 1821, much of public business passed through my hands and had its completion. It was much intermingled, as always, with social scenes, some of which might bear to be recounted, for I believe that every American Minister in England, is apt to find the circle of English hospitality increase around him the longer he stays; but only small portions of it, past or to come, in my case, can be told. I am about to enter upon some account of further negotiations which I conducted with the British Government on subjects, some of which still remain unsettled, and have a deep present interest. It has been for the purpose of reaching the point of time when I was first instructed to open these negotiations, as well as to speak of other international things passing between the Foreign Secretary of England and myself, in connexion with them, that I have passed over the intervals mentioned; lest I should extend to undue limits a work which may already be too long for the reader's patience. Mr. Canning continued at the head of Foreign Affairs during the full remaining term of my mission.

July 29. To-day I received from Mr. Adams, Secretary of State, five dispatches, numbered from 64 to 68; each on a subject in regard to which I am directed to open a negotiation with this Government.

The first bears date the 23d of June, 1823, and relates to the commercial intercourse between the United States and all the British colonies in America; England having opened her West India trade to us by act of Parliament last year, though in a manner which has not proved satisfactory in its practical effects.

The second is dated on the 24th of June, and relates to the suppression of the slave trade.

The third, on the 25th of June, and relates to the unsettled boundary line between the United States and Great Britain, as mentioned in the fifth article of the Treaty of Ghent.

The fourth, on the 26th of June, and relates to the admission of consuls of the United States in the colonial ports of Great Britain.

The fifth, on the 27th of June, and relates to the fishery on the Western coast of Newfoundland.

Instructons are given to me under each of the foregoing heads, with Mr. Adams's accustomed ability. Documents of various kinds are added; and the first dispatch, No. 64, enclosed a full power to me from the President to conclude and sign on behalf of the United States, any treaty or treaties, con-

vention or conventions, to which the negotiation or negotiations might give rise.

A sixth dispatch, numbered 69, came at the same time, dated on the same day with the fifth, which exhibits under one view all the foregoing subjects, and informs me that I am yet to receive instructions on two other subjects, to be included in the full negotiation contemplated; viz. on the Russian Ukase of September 1821, relating to the North West Coast of America, and on the debateable points of maritime law.

August 1. I acknowledge the receipt of all the foregoing instructions and documents, and say to the Secretary of State, that whilst I am sensible to the confidence which the being charged with the discussion and settlement of so many and such important subjects, manifests in me, I feel the heavy responsibility which it creates.

August 16. On the fourth instant I addressed a note to Mr. Canning asking an interview on the subject of the negotiations to be proposed to His Majesty's Government, and he appointed Monday, the eleventh, to receive me. When that arrived, I had not been able, through various interruptions, to give to the whole of my instructions, the careful consideration necessary to make me ready in conversa-

tion on whatever points might happen to be touched even on first broaching the subjects to Mr. Canning. I therefore asked a postponement of the interview, and it accordingly went off until to-day, when it was held at the Foreign Office.

I proceeded to mention to him the various subjects in their order, and further told him that I was in expectation of receiving at an early day instructions upon two other subjects: that of the Russian Ukase, relative to the North West Coast of America, and also on certain points of maritime law, which it was deemed desirable for the two nations to discuss and settle at the same time with all the other questions.

Of the five subjects which I first enumerated, that of the boundary line under the fifth article of the Treaty of Ghent, and that of the Newfoundland Fishery, were those only upon which we entered into any conversation. He spoke of them as those with which he had been least familiar hitherto, and asked an outline of them from me, which I gave him; and in the end I informed him, that I would get ready on my part to go into all or any of the subjects whenever it would suit the convenience of His Majesty's Government to enter upon them, if deciding to entertain the negotiation as proposed.

He replied, that the number and importance of the subjects, added to the novelty of some of them to him at first blush, would render some interval

necessary before the time and manner of taking them all up, could be determined upon; but that I should hear from him again as soon as he was able to give due reflection to the whole matter of my communication. He mentioned also that he was thinking of a short excursion into the country in a few days, and perhaps another in September, as his share of relaxation for the season, after his late parliamentary and other fatigues. I put into his hands an informal memorandum of the different subjects, and reported to my Government what passed at this first interview.

The proper object of it over, I transiently asked him whether, notwithstanding the late news from Spain, we might not still hope that the Spaniards would get the better of their difficulties. I here had allusion to the defection of Ballosteros in Andalusia, an event seeming to threaten with new dangers the constitutional cause in Spain. His reply was general, importing nothing more than his opinion of the increased dangers with which, undoubtedly, the event I alluded to, was calculated to surround the Spanish cause. Pursuing the topic I said, that should France ultimately effect her purpose of overthrowing the constitutional government in Spain, there was at least the consolation left, that Great Britain would not allow her to go further and stop the progress of emancipation in the colonies. By

this remark I meant to recall the sentiments promulgated in Mr. Canning's note to the British Ambassador at Paris of the 31st of March; a note which had immediately preceded the invasion of Spain by the French army under the Duke D' Angouleme. The purport of this note was, that England considered the course of events as having substantially decided the question of the separation of the colonies from Spain, although the formal recognition of their Independence by His Majesty's Government might be hastened or retarded by external causes, as well as by the internal condition of the colonies themselves; and that as England disclaimed all intention of appropriating to herself the smallest portion of the late Spanish possessions in America, she also felt satisfied that no attempt would be made by France to bring any of them under her dominion, either by conquest or by cession from Spain. I considered this note as sufficiently distinct in its import, that England would not remain passive under any such attempt by France; and on my expressing this sentiment, Mr. Canning asked me what I thought my Government would say to going hand in hand with England in such a policy? He did not think that concert of action would become necessary, fully believing that the simple fact of our two countries being known to hold the same opinions, would, by its moral effect, put down the inten-

tion on the part of France, if she entertained it. This belief was founded, he said, upon the large share of the maritime power of the world which Great Britain and the United States held, and the consequent influence which the knowledge of their common policy, on a question involving such important maritime interests, present and future, could not fail to produce every where.

I replied, that in what manner my Government would look upon such a suggestion, I was unable to say; it was one surrounded by important considerations, and I would communicate it to my Government in the same informal manner in which he had thrown it before me. I remarked however, that I could hardly do this to full advantage unless he would at the same time enlighten me as to the precise situation in which England stood in relation to those new communities, and especially on the material point of acknowledging their independence.

He replied that Great Britain certainly never again intended to lend her instrumentality or aid, whether by mediation or otherwise, towards making up the dispute between Spain and her colonies; but that, if this result could still be brought about, she would not interfere to *prevent* it. Upon my here intimating that I had supposed all idea of Spain ever recovering her authority over the colonies, had gone by, he explained by saying that he did not

mean to controvert that opinion, for he too believed that the day had arrived, when all America might be considered as lost to Europe, so far as the tie of political dependence was concerned; all that he meant was, that if Spain and the colonies should be able, agreeing among themselves, to bring the dispute, which was not yet quite over, to a close upon terms satisfactory to both sides, and which would at the same time secure to Spain, as the parent state, commercial advantages not extended to other nations, that Great Britain would not object to a compromise in this spirit of preference to Spain. Upon my again alluding to the extreme improbability of the dispute ever settling down at this late day on such a basis, he said that it was not his intention to gainsay that opinion, having expressed himself as above, rather for the purpose of indicating the feeling which this Cabinet still had towards Spain, than of predicting results.

Wishing to be still more specifically enlightened, I asked if England was, at the present time, taking any steps, or contemplating any, which had reference to the recognition of these new communities, that being the point on which the United States would naturally feel most interest.

He replied, that she had taken none whatever, as yet, but was on the eve of taking one of a preparatory nature, which however would still leave her at

large to recognize or not, according to the position of events at a future period. The measure contemplated was, to send out one or more individuals under authority from this Government, not regularly diplomatic, but clothed with powers in the nature of a commission of inquiry, which he described as analogous to those exercised by our commissioners sent out to South America in 1817, in the persons of Mr. Rodney, Mr. Graham, and Mr. Bland; and that upon the result of this commission, much might depend as to the subsequent course of England. I asked whether it would comprehend all the new communities; to which he replied that it would be confined for the present to Mexico.

Reverting to his first idea, he again said, that he hoped France would not, even should events be favorable to her arms in the Peninsula, extend her views to Spanish America for the purpose of reducing the colonies, nominally indeed for Spain, but in reality to subserve ends of her own; but that if unhappily she did meditate such a course, he was satisfied that the knowledge that the United States would be opposed to it as well as England, could not fail to have its decisive influence in checking it. In this way good might be done, and peaceful prospects made more sure all round. As to the form in which such knowledge might be made to reach France and the other powers of Europe, he said in conclusion

that he thought it might probably be arranged in a manner that would be free from objection.

I again told him that I would not fail to convey his suggestions to my Government and impart to him whatever answer I might receive. In the course of our conversation, I expressed no opinion in favor of them, yet abstained as carefully from saying any thing against them, and on this footing the conversation ended; all which was promptly reported to my Government.

July 20. On the death of Lord Londonderry, Mr. Planta, who had long enjoyed his confidence and esteem, continued his connexion with the Foreign Office, as one of the Under Secretaries of State; Mr. Hamilton, afterwards British Minister at Naples; Lord Clanwilliam, afterwards Minister at Berlin, and Lord Francis Conyngham, having successively acted with him as co-associates in that sphere. Under the present date, I go back a few days in the month in which I recommence my too often disjointed narrative, for the sake of speaking of a dinner at Mr. Planta's, recollected with pleasure, probably by others as well as myself. It was in dining with him to-day (July 20, 1823) that we had Count Lieven, the Russian Ambassador; Count Martin D'Aglie, the Sardinian Envoy; Mr. Canning, the Foreign Secretary; Mr. Huskisson, President of the

Board of Trade; Mr. Robinson, Chancellor of the Exchequer;* Lord Granville, Lord George Bentinck, Lord Francis Conyngham, Mr. Charles Ellis, of the House of Commons, and Lord Howard de Walden.

It would not have been easy to assemble a company better fitted to make a dinner party agreeable, or to have brought them together at a better moment. Parliament having just risen, Mr. Canning and his two colleagues of the cabinet, Mr. Huskisson and Mr. Robinson, seemed like birds let out of a cage. There was much small talk, some of it very sprightly. Ten o'clock arriving with little disposition to rise from table, Mr. Canning proposed that we should play "Twenty Questions." This was new to me, and the other members of the diplomatic corps present, though we had all been a good while in England. The game consisted in endeavors to find out your thoughts by asking twenty questions. The questions were to be put plainly, though in the alternative if desired; the answers to be also plain and direct; the object of your thoughts, not to be an abstract idea, or any thing so occult, or scientific, or technical, as not to be supposed to enter into the knowledge of the company, but something well known to the present day, or to general history and literature; it might be any name of renown, ancient or modern, man or woman; or any work or memo-

* The present Earl of Ripon.

rial of art well known; but not a mere event, as a battle for instance. These were mentioned as among the general rules of the game, serving to denote its character. It was agreed that Mr. Canning, assisted by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who sat next to him, should put the questions; and that I, assisted by Lord Granville, who sat next to me, should give the answers. Lord Granville and myself were consequently to have the thought, or secret, in common; and it was well understood, that the discovery of it, if made, was to be the fair result of mental inference from the questions and answers, not of signs passing, or hocus pocus of any description. With these as the preliminaries, and the parties sitting face to face on opposite sides of the table, we began the battle.

First question by Mr. Canning. Does what you have thought of belong to the animal or vegetable kingdom? Answer—To the vegetable.

Second question. Is it manufactured, or unmanufactured? Manufactured.

Third. Is it a solid or a liquid? A solid. (How could it be a liquid, said one of the company slyly, unless vegetable soup!)

Fourth. Is it a thing entire in itself, or in parts? Entire.

Fifth. Is it for private use, or public? Public.

Sixth. Does it exist in England, or out of it? In England.

Seventh. Is it single, or are there others of the same kind? Single.

Eighth. Is it historical, or only existent at present? Both.

Ninth. For ornament or use? Both.

Tenth. Has it any connexion with the person of the King? No.

Eleventh. Is it carried, or does it support itself? The former.

Twelfth. Does it pass by succession? [Neither Lord Grenville nor myself being quite certain on this point, the question was not answered; but as it was thought that the very hesitation to answer might serve to shed light upon the secret, it was agreed that the question should be counted as one, in the progress of the game.]

Thirteenth. Was it used at the coronation? Yes.

Fourteenth. In the Hall or Abbey? Probably in both; certainly in the Hall.

Fifteenth. Does it belong specially to the ceremony of the coronation, or is it used at other times? It is used at other times.

Sixteenth. Is it exclusively of a vegetable nature, or is it not in some parts a compound of a vegetable and a mineral? Exclusively of a vegetable nature.

Seventeenth. What is its shape? This question was objected to, as too particular; and the company inclining to think so, it was withdrawn; but Mr.

Canning saying that it would be hard upon him to let it be counted, as it had been withdrawn, the decision was in his favor on that point, and it was not counted.

Seventeenth, repeated. Is it decorated or simple? We made a stand against this question also, as too particular; but the company not inclining to sustain us this time, I had to answer it, and said that it was simple.

Eighteenth. Is it used in the ordinary ceremonial of the House of Commons or House of Lords? No.

Nineteenth. Is it ever used by either House? No.

Twentieth. Is it generally stationary or moveable? Moveable.

The whole number of questions being now exhausted, there was a dead pause. The interest had gone on increasing as the game advanced, until, coming to the last question, it grew to be like neck and neck at the close of a race. Mr. Canning was evidently under concern lest he should be foiled, as by the law of the game he would have been, if he had not now solved the enigma. He sat silent for a minute or two; then, rolling his rich eye about, and with a countenance a little anxious, and in an accent by no means over confident, he exclaimed, "I think it must be the wand of the Lord High Steward!" And it was—EVEN SO.

This wand is a long, plain, white staff, not much thicker than your middle finger, and, as such, justifies all the answers given.

In answering the ninth question, Lord Granville and I, who conferred together in a whisper as to all answers not at once obvious, remembered that some quaint old English writers say that the Lord High Steward carried his *staff* to beat off intruders from His Majesty's treasury! When at the twelfth, Mr. Canning illustrated the nature of his question by referring to the *rod of the Lord Chamberlain*, which he said did not pass by succession, each new incumbent procuring, as he supposed, a new one for himself. I said that it was not the Lord Chamberlain's rod; but the very mention of this was "*burning*," as children say when they play hide-and-seek; and in answering that it was not, I had to take care of my emphasis.

The questions were not put in the rapid manner in which they will be read, but sometimes after considerable intervals, not of silence—for they were enlivened by occasional remarks thrown in by the company, all of whom grew intent upon the pastime as it advanced, though Mr. Canning alone put the questions, and I alone gave out the answers. It lasted upwards of an hour, the wine ceasing to go round. On Mr. Canning's success, for it was touch and go with him, there was a burst of approbation,

we of the diplomatic corps saying that we must be very careful not to let him ask us too many questions at the Foreign Office, lest he should find out every secret that we had!

The number of the questions and latitude allowed in putting them, added to the restrictions imposed upon the selection of the secret, leave to the person putting them, a less difficult task than might at first be imagined; and accordingly such of the company as had witnessed the pastime before, said that the discovery generally took place by the time the questions were half gone through—sometimes sooner; and that they had never known it protracted to the twentieth until this occasion. It is obvious that each successive question with its answer, goes on narrowing the ground of defence, until at last the assailant drives his antagonist into a corner, almost forcing a surrender of the secret. Nevertheless, this presupposes skill in putting the questions, and he who consents to take that part in the game, must know what he can do. It was not until twelve o'clock that we all rose from table, and went up stairs to coffee. So it is that these Ministers of State relax; and it was a spectacle not without interest to see such men as Canning, Huskisson, and Robinson giving themselves up to this kind of recreation, as a contrast—in the first, to his anxious labors in the whole field of Foreign Affairs; in the second, to his

speeches on the sugar question, the warehousing system, and on alterations in the tariff; and in the third, to his endless mass of financial matters, during a long and toilsome session of Parliament just ended.*

Dining at the Marquis of Stafford's, at a subsequent day, this pastime was spoken of; and it was mentioned that Mr. Pitt and Mr. Windham, were both fond of it. Lord Stafford said that the former had once succeeded in it, when the secret was the *stone* upon which Walworth, Lord Mayor of London stood when he struck down Wat Tyler in Richard the Second's time; and his impression was that Mr. Pitt had triumphed at an early stage of his questions.

* An account of this game appeared in print in 1840.

CHAPTER XXI.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM MR. CANNING ON THE AFFAIRS OF SPANISH AMERICA, AND STEPS TAKEN UNDER THEM. FURTHER INSTRUCTIONS ON THE PROPOSED NEGOTIATION. FURTHER COMMUNICATION FROM MR. CANNING ON THE AFFAIRS OF SPANISH AMERICA.

August 22. This day brought me an important note from Mr. Canning, dated the twentieth instant —Foreign Office. He informs me that before leaving town, he is desirous of bringing before me in a more distinct, but still in an unofficial and confidential shape, the question opened and shortly discussed between us on the sixteenth instant.

He asks if the moment has not arrived when our two Governments might understand each other as to the Spanish American colonies; and if so, whether it would not be expedient for ourselves, and beneficial for all the world, that our principles in regard to them should be clearly settled and avowed. That as to England, she had no disguise on the subject:

1. She conceived the recovery of the colonies by Spain, to be hopeless.

2. That the question of their recognition as Independent States, was one of time and circumstances.

3. That England was not disposed however, to throw any impediment in the way of an arrangement between the colonies and mother country, by amicable negotiation.

4. That she aimed at the possession of no portion of the colonies for herself.

5. That she could not see the transfer of any portion of them to any other power, with indifference.

That if the United States acceded to such views, a declaration to that effect on their part, concurrently with England, would be the most effectual and least offensive mode of making known their joint disapprobation of contrary projects; that it would at the same time put an end to all the jealousies of Spain with respect to her remaining colonies; and to the agitation prevailing in the colonies themselves, by showing that England and the United States were determined not to profit by encouraging it. And I am asked in conclusion, whether I consider that the full power which I had lately received from my Government would authorize me to enter into negotiation to sign a convention on the above subject; and if not, if I could exchange with him, as the organ of the British Government, ministerial notes in relation to it.

Such was the purport of his communication. It

was framed in a spirit of great cordiality, and expressed an opinion that seldom, perhaps, at any time among nations, had an opportunity occurred when so small an effort of two friendly governments might produce so unequivocal a good, and prevent such extensive calamities.

August 23. I replied to Mr. Canning's note to the following effect: I said that the Government of the United States, having in the most formal manner acknowledged the independence of the late Spanish provinces in America, desired to see it maintained with stability, and under auspices that might promise happiness to the new states themselves, as well as advantage to the rest of the world; and that, as conducing to those great ends, my Government had long desired, and still anxiously desired, to see them received into the family of nations by the powers of Europe, and especially by Great Britain.

That in other respects, I believed the sentiments unfolded in his note were shared by the United States; because, first, we considered the recovery of the colonies by Spain, to be entirely hopeless. 2. We would throw no impediment in the way of an arrangement between them and the mother country by amicable negotiation, supposing an arrangement of such a nature to be possible. 3. We did not aim at the possession of any of those communities for

ourselves. Fourth and last, we should regard as highly unjust, and as fruitful of disastrous consesequences, any attempt on the part of any European power, to take possession of them by conquest, by cession, or on any other ground or pretext whatever.

But I added, that in what manner my Government might deem it most expedient to avow these principles, or express its disapprobation of the exceptionable projects alluded to, were points on which all my instructions were silent, as well as the power I had lately received to enter upon negotiations with His Majesty's Government; but that I would promptly make known to the President the opinions and views of which he had made me the depository, and that I was of nothing more sure than that he would fully appreciate their importance, and not less the frank and friendly feelings towards the United States which their communication to me bespoke.

I immediately transmitted to my Government a copy of the foregoing correspondence in the following dispatch to the Secretary of State; preparing it in quadruplicate, with a request to the consul at Liverpool to send them off by the earliest ships for New York or other ports of the United States.

LONDON, *August* 23, 1823.

SIR:

I yesterday received from Mr. Canning a note

headed "private and confidential," setting before me in a more distinct form, the proposition respecting South American affairs which he communicated to me in conversation on the sixteenth instant, as already reported in my dispatch number 323. I lose no time in transmitting a copy of his note, as well as a copy of my answer, written and sent to-day.

In framing the answer on my own judgment alone, I feel that I have had a task of some embarrassment, and shall be happy if it receive the President's approbation.

I believe that this Government has the subject of Mr. Canning's proposition much at heart, and certainly his note bears upon the face of it a character of earnestness, as well as cordiality towards the Government of the United States, which cannot escape notice.

I have therefore thought it proper to meet this spirit, as far as I could, consistently with other and paramount considerations.

These I conceived to be chiefly twofold; first, the danger of pledging my Government to any measure of foreign policy which might in any degree, now or hereafter, implicate it in the federative system of Europe; and secondly, I have felt myself alike without warrant to take a step which might prove exceptionable in the eyes of France, with whom our

pacific and friendly relations remain, I presume, undisturbed, whatever may be our speculative abhorrence of her attack upon the right of self-government in Spain.

In framing my answer, I had also to consider what was due to Spain herself; and I hope that I have not overlooked what was due to the colonies.

The whole subject is novel, and open to views on which I have deliberated anxiously. If my answer shall be thought, on the whole, to bear properly on all the public considerations which belong most materially to the occasion, it will be a source of great satisfaction to me.

The tone of earnestness in Mr. Canning's note, naturally starts the inference that the British Cabinet cannot be without its serious apprehensions that ambitious enterprises are meditated against the Independence of the new Spanish American States; whether by France alone, or in conjunction with the continental powers, I cannot now say, on any authentic grounds.

I have the honor to remain
With very great respect,
Your obedient servant,
RICHARD RUSH.

The Honorable
JOHN QUINCY ADAMS,
Secretary of State.

August 26. To-day brings me a second confidential communication from Mr. Canning, of the following tenor, dated Liverpool, the twenty-third instant: He says, that since he wrote to me on the twentieth, an additional motive had occurred for wishing that we might come to some understanding promptly on the Spanish American question, and be at liberty to announce it to the world. The motive was, that England had received notice, though not such as imposed the necessity of instant action, that as soon as the military objects in Spain were achieved, which France expected (how justly he could not determine,) to achieve very speedily, a proposal would be made for a congress in Europe, or some other concert and consultation, specifically on the affairs of Spanish America; and he adds, that he need not point out to me the complications to which such a proposal, however dealt with by England, might lead.

August 27. I reply to Mr. Canning's second communication by saying, that in my note to him of the twenty-third, (not received when his second was written,) two principal ideas had place.

1. That the United States desired to see the Independence of the late Spanish Provinces in America, permanently maintained.

2. That they would view as unjust and improper,

any attempt on the part of the Powers of Europe to intrench upon that Independence.

And in my note of to-day I said, that my Government, I was sure, would regard as alike objectionable, any interference whatever in the affairs of Spanish America, unsolicited by the late Provinces themselves, and against their will; that it would regard the convening of a congress to deliberate upon their affairs as a measure uncalled for, and indicative of a policy highly unfriendly to the tranquillity of the world; that it could never look with insensibility upon such an exercise of European jurisdiction over communities now of right exempt from it, and entitled to regulate their own concerns unmolested from abroad. I further said, that if he supposed any of these sentiments, or those expressed in my first note, might be moulded by me into a form promising to accomplish the object he proposed, I would be happy to receive and take into consideration whatever suggestions he would favor me with to that end, either in writing, or in the full and unreserved intercourse of conversation when he returned to town. Lastly I said, that could England see fit to consider the time as now arrived for fully acknowledging the Independence of the new communities, I believed, that not only would it accelerate the steps of my Government, but that it would naturally place

me in a new position, in my further course with him on the whole subject.

I immediately transmitted copies of these notes to my Government, in the following dispatch to the Secretary of State—to go with like promptitude as the former.

LONDON, *August* 28, 1823.

SIR:

Since my last dispatch, I have received a second confidential note from Mr. Canning, dated at Liverpool, the twenty-third instant, a copy of which, and of my answer dated yesterday, are enclosed. The subject of our correspondence being, as it appears to me, of deep interest, I think proper to apprise you of it from step to step, without waiting for the further developments to which it may lead.

Mr. Canning having now distinctly informed me that he has received notice of measures being in projection by the Powers of Europe relative to the affairs of Spanish America, as soon as the French succeed in their military movements against Spain, which it would seem from Mr. Canning's note they expect to do soon, I cannot avoid seeing the subject under the complications to which he alludes.

My first object will be to urge upon this Government the expediency of an immediate and unreserved recognition of the Independence of the Spanish American States.

It will be seen by my note of yesterday to Mr. Canning, that I have made a beginning in this work, and should the opportunity be afforded me, it is my intention to follow it up zealously.

Should I be asked by Mr. Canning, whether, in case the recognition be made by Great Britain without more delay, I am on my part prepared to make a declaration, in the name of my Government, that it will not remain inactive under an attack upon the independence of those States by the Holy Alliance, the present determination of my judgment is, that I *will* make such a declaration explicitly, and avow it before the world.

I am not unaware of the responsibility which I should, by such a measure, assume upon myself; but my reasons would be these:

1. I may thereby aid in achieving an immediate and positive good to those rising States in our hemisphere; for such I should conceive their recognition by Great Britain at this juncture, to be.

2. Such recognition, cooperating with the declaration which this Government has already in effect made, that it will not remain passive if Spanish America is attacked, and followed up by a similar declaration from me that neither will the United States, would prove at least a probable means of warding off the attack. The Foreign Secretary of

England it appears, is under a strong belief that it would; and this without the recognition by England, being as yet a part of his case.

3. Should the issue of things be different, and events notwithstanding arise threatening the peace of the United States, or otherwise seriously to affect their interests in any way in consequence of such a declaration by me, it would still remain for the wisdom of my Government to disavow my conduct, as it would manifestly have been without its previous warrant. I would take to myself all the reproach, consoled under the desire that had animated me to render benefits of great magnitude to the cause of Spanish American Independence at a point of time which, if lost, was not to be recalled.

4. My conduct might be disavowed in any issue of the transaction, and I should still not be without hope that the President would see in it proofs of good intention, mixed with zeal for the advancement of political interests, not indifferent, ultimately, to the welfare of the United States themselves.

The result of my reasoning in a word then is, that I find myself placed suddenly in a situation in which by deciding and acting promptly, I may do much public good, whilst public mischief may be arrested by the controlling hand of my Government, should my conduct be likely to draw down any mischief.

I conclude with the usual assurances of great respect with which

I have the honor to be
Your obedient servant,
RICHARD RUSH.

The Honorable
JOHN QUINCY ADAMS,
Secretary of State.

August 30.
~~April 30.~~ I have received, and this day acknowledge, the Secretary of State's dispatch, number 70, of the second of July, relative to the North West Coast of America;* his number 71, of the twenty-eighth of July, relative to maritime questions, and principles of maritime and commercial neutrality; and his number 72, of the twenty-ninth of July, embracing some general reflections upon the extent and importance of the whole negotiation committed to my hands.

I remark, that having now before me all his instructions, I am fully sensible of the magnitude of the subjects to be treated of; "of the complicated character," here using some of the Secretary's own words, "of the considerations involved in most of them, and of their momentous bearings, in present and future ages, upon the interests, the welfare, and the honor of the United States." I add the expression anew of the deep sense which I entertain of the

* Oregon Territory.

President's confidence in committing to my hands negotiations so extensive.

The Secretary in his number 72 also mentions, that Mr. Stratford Canning, at the period of its date, was at New York on the eve of his return to England; and that whilst exercising his Mission in Washington, he had shown in all his official relations with our Government a "very high sense of honor, and connected with it, a quality inestimable in a statesman—a conscious sense of moral obligation;" and that his conduct during his residence had "been in all the social relations, exemplary." I am requested to mention these sentiments to this Government.

September 1. In writing to the Secretary of State on the importance of the contemplated negotiations, and of the labor of investigation as well as extent of responsibility which it will devolve upon me, I express a wish that the President would be pleased to assign me a colleague. I add, that to associate a colleague with me, would conform to the past practice of our Government, which had always been, on occasions of difficult and complicated negotiations, to employ more than one negotiator; more especially, when the European Power employed more than one.

September 7. I receive another communication from Mr. Canning, dated Storrs, Westmoreland, the

thirty-first of August. He acknowledges the receipt of both my letters in answer to both of his, and says, that whatever may be the practical results of the correspondence between us, it is very satisfactory to him to find that the spirit in which it began on his part, had been met so cordially on my part.

He goes on to say in effect, that but for my want of specific powers to go forward in the proposition he made, he would have taken measures to give it operation on the part of England; but that, through the delay which must intervene before I could receive new powers from home, events might get before us; and that therefore he could not justify it to his duty to his own Government, and to all the other considerations belonging to the subject, to pledge England to wait for such a contingency—for which he assigns his reasons with frankness. He concludes by saying, that if I should see enough hope of good in his proposition to warrant me in asking powers and instructions in relation to it, in addition to all the other heads on which I had recently been empowered and instructed, I must then consider it *not* as a proposition already made, but as evidence of the nature of one which it would have been his desire to make, had he found me provided with authority to entertain it; this view of the subject now becoming necessary, that England may remain untrammeled in the meantime.

I transmitted this last communication to my Government on the day following, saying to the Secretary of State, that although it appeared from it, that Mr. Canning was not prepared to pledge this Government to an immediate recognition of the independence of the new states, I should nevertheless renew a proposition to that effect when we met; but that should he continue to draw back from it, I should decline acting upon the overtures contained in his first note, not feeling at liberty to accede to them in the name of the United States, but upon the basis of an equivalent; and that, as I viewed the subject, this equivalent could be nothing less than the immediate and full acknowledgment of those states, or some of them, by Great Britain.

September 10. Take steps to apprise the Deputies of Spanish America in London, of the hostile views of France and the continental powers, should the arms of the former succeed in Spain. I make no mention of Mr. Canning's name, or any allusion to it, as the source of my information; which information, although it may not be new to these Deputies, I impart to put them still more on their guard.

September 12. Take further steps to warn the Deputies of the plans of France and the Allies, withholding altogether, as before, the source of my infor-

mation, but letting it be understood that the information is not to be slighted.

September 15. Write to President Monroe, and in continuation of the Spanish American subject say, that Mr. Canning being still out of town, I was giving myself up to investigations which might the better prepare me for taking in hand the various subjects which his confidence had devolved upon me, to discuss and arrange with this Government; that on Mr. Canning's return, I should expect to be invited to an interview, and doubted not but that the whole topic of Spanish American affairs would be resumed between us. That it was still my intention to urge upon him the immediate recognition of the new states by Great Britain, as the only footing upon which I could feel warranted in acceding to the proposal he had made to me; that otherwise our two countries would not stand upon equal ground in going into the measure proposed, we having already acknowledged the new states; but that I would continue to receive in the most conciliatory manner, new overtures from him, should he meditate any new ones; for that my most careful observation in England during my residence, had impressed me with the belief, that the present Administration, with Lord Liverpool still at its head, was as favorably disposed towards us as any that could be formed.

CHAPTER XXII.

FULL INTERVIEW WITH MR. CANNING ON THE AFFAIRS OF SPANISH AMERICA, AND REPORT OF WHAT PASSED TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES. FURTHER INTERVIEW ON THE SAME SUBJECT; AND ON THAT OF THE NEGOTIATION—TO THE OPENING OF WHICH ENGLAND ACCEDES. MR. HUSKISSON AND MR. STRATFORD CANNING, TO BE THE BRITISH NEGOTIATORS. RENEWED INTERVIEW WITH MR. CANNING ON THE AFFAIRS OF SPANISH AMERICA, AND REPORT OF WHAT PASSED.

September 18. Had a full conference with Mr. Canning at the Foreign Office, in which the subject of Spanish American affairs was resumed, and the discussion of it gone into at large.

September 19. I reported in the following dispatch to the Secretary of State, all that passed in my interview with Mr. Canning yesterday; relying only upon the substantial fidelity of the report, as it must needs fall short of what is due to Mr. Canning in language,

though I endeavored to recall his own words as far as I could.

No. 331.

LONDON, *September* 19, 1823.

SIR,

Mr. Canning returned to town about a week ago, and I had an interview with him at the Foreign Office yesterday, at his request.

He entered at once upon the subject of Spanish America, remarking that he thought it claimed precedence over all others between us at the present juncture. Military events in the Peninsula, seemed every day to be drawing nearer to a crisis in favor of the French arms, and the political arrangements projected afterwards, would, there was good reason to suppose, be immediately directed to the affairs of the late colonies. He would therefore not give up the hope, notwithstanding the footing upon which this subject appeared to be placed at the close of our recent correspondence, that I might yet see my way towards a substantial acquiescence in his proposals. They were hourly assuming new importance and urgency, under aspects to which neither of our Governments could be insensible.

Having perceived since we had been last together, the publication in the newspapers of the correspondence of a portion of the merchants of London with the Foreign Office, respecting the appointment of

consuls or commercial agents for the Spanish American states, I asked Mr. Canning, whether I was to infer that this Government was about to adopt such a measure; to which he replied in the affirmative, saying that commercial agents would certainly be soon appointed and sent out to the proper ports in those new communities.

As to the proposals he had submitted to me, I said, that I was sure he would himself appreciate the delicacy and novelty of the ground upon which I stood. The United States, it was true, would view any attempt on the part of France and the Continental Alliance to resubjugate those new states, as a transcendent act of national injustice, and indicative of progressive and alarming ambition; yet to join Great Britain in a declaration to this effect, might lay them open in some respects to consequences, upon the character and extent of which it became my duty to reflect with great caution, before making up my mind to meet the responsibilities of them. The value of my declaration, it was agreed, would depend upon its being formally made known to Europe. Would not such a step wear the appearance of the United States implicating themselves in the political connexions of Europe? Would it not be acceding, in this instance at least, to the policy of one of the great European Powers, in opposition to the projects avowed by others of the first

rank? This, hitherto, had been no part of the system of the United States; the very reverse of it had been acted upon. Their foreign policy had been essentially bottomed on the great maxim of preserving peace and harmony with all nations, without offending any, or forming entangling alliances with any. Upon the institutions as upon the dissensions of the European Powers, the government and people of the United States might form and even express, their speculative opinions; but it had been no part of their past conduct to interfere with the one, or, being unmolested themselves, to become parties to the other. In this broad principle, laid one of my difficulties under his proposals.

He replied, that however just such a policy might have been formerly, or might continue to be as a general policy, he apprehended that powerful and controlling circumstances made it inapplicable upon the present occasion. The question was a new and complicated one in modern affairs. It was also full as much American as European, to say no more. It concerned the United States under aspects and interests as immediate and commanding, as it did or could any of the States of Europe. They were the first Power established on that continent, and now confessedly the leading Power. They were connected with Spanish America by their position, as with Europe by their relations; and they also stood

connected with these new states by political relations. Was it possible they could see with indifference their fate decided upon by Europe? Could Europe expect this indifference? Had not a new epoch arrived in the relative position of the United States towards Europe, which Europe must acknowledge? Were the great political and commercial interests which hung upon the destinies of the new continent, to be canvassed and adjusted in this hemisphere, without the cooperation or even knowledge of the United States? Were they to be canvassed and adjusted, he would even add, without some proper understanding between the United States and Great Britain, as the two chief commercial and maritime States of both worlds? He hoped not, he would wish to persuade himself not. Such was the tenor of his remarks.

I said that his suggestions were entitled to great consideration, and that such, and others of the same nature, would probably not escape the attention of my Government, as they had not mine. There might, I was aware, be room for thinking, that the late formation of these new states in our hemisphere, would impose new political duties upon the United States, not merely as coupled with the great cause of national freedom, but as closely connected also with their own present and future interests, and even the very existence, finally, of their own institutions.

That for myself, speaking only as an individual, I could well conceive, that the interposition of an authoritative voice by the United States in favor of these new communities, admitting that the Powers of Europe usurped a claim to control their destinies, would imply no real departure from the principles which had hitherto regulated their foreign intercourse, or pledge them henceforth to the political connexions of the old world. If, too, that voice happened to be in unison with the voice of Great Britain, I admitted that it might prove but the more auspicious to the common object which both nations had in view, without committing either to any systematic or ulterior concert; but I added, that as the question of the United States expressing this voice and promulgating it under official authority to the Powers of Europe, was one of entire novelty as well as great magnitude in their history, it was for my Government and not me to decide upon its propriety. Concomitant duties, and consequences of a momentous nature, might be bound up in such a step. I was willing to take upon myself all fair responsibility attaching to the station which I held; but here was a conjuncture wholly new. It presented a case not seeming to fall within the range of any of the contingent or discretionary duties that could have been in contemplation when I was clothed with my commission as Minister to this Court. For meeting a

case thus extraordinary, if I could do so at all, I ought to have some justification beyond any that had yet been laid before me. Such was my opinion; such the conclusion to which I had been forced to come on full deliberation.

He said that the case being new, might serve to account for my not being in possession of previous or specific powers bearing upon it, but that its very nature precluded delay. He had the strongest reasons for believing that the cooperation of the United States with England, through my instrumentality afforded with promptitude, would ward off altogether the meditated jurisdiction of the European Powers over the new world. Could higher motives exist to cooperation, and immediately? Let it be delayed until I could receive specific powers, and the day might go by; the progress of events was rapid; the public evil might come on. A portion of it might and probably would be, consummated; and even admitting that Great Britain could, by herself, afterwards arrest it, preventive measures among nations were always preferable, whether on the score of humanity or policy, to those that were remedial. Why then should the United States, whose institutions resembled those of Great Britain more than they did those of the other Powers in Europe, and whose policy upon this occasion was closely approximated to hers, hesitate to act with her to promote a

common object, approved alike by both, and achieve a common good, estimated alike by both? Such was the drift of his remarks, which he amplified and enforced with his wonted ability. He finished by saying, that his station and duties as the organ of this Government would oblige him to call upon me in another way, if I continued to feel unable to assent to his past proposals; for said he, "If a congress be in fact assembled on the affairs of Spanish America, I shall ask that you, as the representative of the United States at this Court, be invited to attend it; and if you should not be invited, I shall reserve to myself the option of determining whether or not Great Britain will send a representative to it." After a moment's pause, he added, "Should you be invited and refuse to go, I shall still reserve to myself the same option; so you see how essential it is, in the opinion of Great Britain, that the United States should not be left out of view, if Europe should determine to take cognizance of the subject." Words so remarkable could not fail to make a distinct impression upon me, and I give them as they fell from him, as nearly as I can.

"The complication of the subject," said I, "may be cured at once, and by Great Britain. Let Great Britain immediately and unequivocally *acknowledge the Independence of the new States.* This will put an end to all difficulty; the moment is auspicious; every

thing invites to the measure, justice, expediency, humanity, the repose of the world, the cause of national independence, the prosperity and happiness of both hemispheres; let Britain but adopt this measure, so just in itself, so recommended by the point of time before us, and the cause of all Spanish America triumphs; the European Congress might meet *afterwards*, if it chose to take so harmless a step."

He said that such a measure was open to objection, but asked if he was to understand that it would make any difference in my powers or conduct?

I replied, the greatest difference. I had frankly informed him that I had no powers to consent to his proposals in the shape in which they had first been presented to me in his note, and I would as frankly say that I had no *specific* powers to consent to them, coupled with the fact of this Government acknowledging the independence of the new states; but, that great step being taken, I would stand upon my general powers, as Minister Plenipotentiary. Into these, other nations would have no claim to look. I would be the interpreter of them myself. I had no hesitation in saying, that under their general warrant I would put forth with Great Britain the declaration to which he had invited me; that I would do so in the name of my Government, and consent to its formal promulgation to the world, under all the sanctions, and with all the present validity, that I

could impart to it. I had examined all my instructions for years past, bearing either directly or remotely on the great cause of these new states. I saw in them all so steady and strong a desire for the firm establishment of their freedom and independence; I saw too, sometimes in their letter and always in their spirit, so concurrent a desire to see their independence acknowledged by Great Britain, as I had often made known to Lord Castlereagh, that I would not scruple, on seeing that important event come about, to lend my official name to the course proposed, and count upon my Government stamping with its subsequent approval the part which I acted. No other authority would be likely in the mean time to draw into question what I did; and if I could thus be instrumental in any degree towards accelerating the acknowledgment of Spanish American Independence, I should feel that I had achieved a positive and great good. Upon British recognition hung, not indeed the final, but perhaps in an eminent degree the present tranquillity and happiness of those states. Their final safety was not, as I believed, at the mercy of European dictation; but we could not disguise from ourselves that it might prolong their sufferings and cast fresh clouds over their prospects. It was in this manner that I expressed myself, imparting to him, with entire candor, my feelings and determinations; as well as

the precise ground upon which the step I was called upon to take, ought to rest, and would place me.

He said that among the objections to recognizing, at present, was still that of the uncertain condition, internally, of these new states, or at any rate of some of them. He had, for example, sent an agent in January last, to Mexico, supposing that Yturbide, was at the head of affairs; but by the time he had arrived, a fresh revolution had set up other representatives of the executive authority. The same internal vicissitudes were to be remarked in other of these communities, more to the south.

Another objection he said was started by the circumstances of the Columbian loan, which had created uneasiness in portions of the stock market of London for a twelve month past. It was true, that as this subject actually stood, the British Government owed no obligation to those British subjects who had embarked their money in an adventure, of the safety of which they had themselves chosen to be the judges. But suppose the recognition to have been made by Great Britian some time ago, as was wished, and the loan to have followed, would not the duty of countenance and protection have attached, and might not this serve to portray the hazards of coming too hastily into political relations with new and distant states, whose credit, or whose resources, in their transactions with the subjects of other

nations did not as yet appear to rest on any stable or adequate foundation?

As regarded the latter topic I replied, that it was beyond my competence to disentangle all its details. All that I could say was, that the Government of Columbia, as far as I was informed, had fallen into no departure from good faith in the transaction, and it yet remained to be known whether that Government would not in the end give satisfaction to all the parties concerned. But, far from an obstacle to recognition, it appeared to me that the incident in question, fairly led to opposite conclusions; for, if Columbia at the period of contracting the loan, had been admitted to regular relations with this Government, it is to be presumed that the powers of her diplomatic agents would have been open to other examinations than they appear to have received, and the whole transaction thus have been freed from the subsequent embarrassments which surrounded it.

As to internal vicissitudes, I remarked, that the dilemma thence arising was not greater than had been witnessed in France during a period of more than twenty years, while her revolution was in progress; than had been seen in Naples more recently, or than was experienced at the present time by Great Britain in her diplomatic intercourse with both Portugal and Spain. Had we not seen revolutions and counter revolutions, Royal Governments,

Constitutional Governments, and Regency Governments, succeeding each other almost day by day in the oldest countries of Europe? Why then be surprised at changes in the new world? These very changes would be likely to be largely, if not entirely, checked, by the fact of the new states being recognized by Europe. It would tend to give stability to their institutions; and, by breaking down the hopes of the discontented and factious among themselves, become guarantees for their greater internal tranquillity. They had given ample proofs both of military power and political wisdom. Look at Buenos Ayres, which as long back as 1807, could repulse the well appointed legions of even Britain herself. Look at Columbia, who was now laying the groundwork of a confederacy for all Spanish America, and at the same time marching her auxiliary forces into Peru, to uphold the cause of emancipation upon that shore. Every thing attested the stability of that cause. Spain might go on with her languid efforts and protract the miseries of war; but over Spanish American Independence, she had no longer any control. Europe had no control over it. It was a question forever settled. It would soon be seen by Britain that the United States in their proposals for adjusting with Russia, and with Britain, the respective pretensions of the three powers on the coast of the Pacific, were forced to take for granted

the Independence of all the late colonies of Spain on that continent, as the inevitable basis of all just and practical negotiation. Their independence was, in fine, the new political element of modern times, and must henceforth pervade the political arrangements of both worlds. Why then should Britain longer forbear to acknowledge this Independence? She had already done so in effect, and why should she not in form? She had already by her solemn statutes, made her trade with those new states lawful; she had stood ready to support it with her squadrons; she was on the eve of sending out commercial agents to reside in some or all of them, as the guardians of British interests—all this she had done, and more. She had declared in her state papers, that the question of their Independence was *substantially* decided, though the formal recognition of it might be retarded or hastened by external circumstances. What external circumstances could be imagined more imperious for hastening this formal recognition than those now existing, when Spain was seen to be wholly incapacitated from regaining dominion over them, and continental Europe meditating such unwarrantable designs upon them?

It was thus that I endeavored to unfold what I suppose to be the views and convictions of the President, upon this important subject. Our conversation was a prolonged one, and characterized by the free-

dom with which I have reported it; in doing which, I have sedulously aimed at faithfully presenting all its material points. I do not flatter myself with any sanguine belief that this Government will be prepared to yield to my appeals, in favor of immediate recognition; but I am to have another interview with Mr. Canning on a day that he is yet to name, and I can only say, that I will be prepared to renew and extend them as opportunities may be afforded me.

Not knowing what other topics might rise up during our interview, I had carried several of my papers with me, and amongst them a copy of your dispatch, number 71. I was glad that I did so, for thinking that the sentiments which it so forcibly expresses, on the value of the existing and prospective concord between our two countries, would be acceptable, I did not scruple, in unison with the spirit of our conversation, to read to him, before we separated, its introductory pages. He was struck with their applicability, and I hope that so opportune an exhibition to him of such sentiments, recently coming to me from the high source of my Government, may not be without its value.

Should a congress be assembled to crush Spanish American Independence, and I receive an invitation to attend it, I shall not go, though the time for me to say so here will not arrive until the invitation comes. First, I should have no warrant from the President

to attend it; and next, I infer from what Mr. Canning said on this point, that England may, perhaps, not incline to send a representative to it, should the United States have none. I should, in this manner, do more good by my absence, than my presence could effect. Mr. Canning, as it appeared, was not entirely aware, until yesterday, that I was prepared to come fully into his views, if this Government would immediately acknowledge the new States. I had intended that the concluding sentence of my note to him of the twenty-seventh of August, already transmitted to you, should start the idea to his mind, though I abstained from putting it forth more openly at that period of our correspondence.

I have the honor to remain,
With very great respect,
Your obedient servant,
RICHARD RUSH.

The Honorable
JOHN QUINCY ADAMS,
Secretary of State.

September 26. Had another interview with Mr. Canning at Gloucester Lodge, at his request. The subject of our discussions, on the eighteenth instant, was renewed. He informed me of a dispatch he had received from Sir Charles Stuart, British Ambassador at Paris, which had a bearing upon them. It

mentioned a conversation he had held with Mr. Sheldon, Chargé d'Affaires of the United States at Paris, the purport of which was, that Sir Charles having mentioned to Mr. Sheldon the projects of France and the continental Alliance, against Spanish America, the latter replied, that the Government of the United States was aware of them, and disapproved of them. Mr. Canning, inferring that this reply of our Chargé d'Affaires, in Paris, probably rested upon some new instructions to him from Washington, also inferred that, if so, it might probably lend its aid towards my consent to his proposals to me of the twentieth of August. He was the rather induced to give way to this hope, he said, as the dispatch of Sir Charles Stuart was written altogether on his own motion, without any previous communication received from him, Mr. Canning, upon the subject.

I replied, that I could not undertake to say, with any confidence, what instructions might have been sent to the United States Legation at Paris on this subject; but that I scarcely believed that any could have reached it not common to me, and that I was still without any, beyond the general instructions I had unfolded to him in our interview on the eighteenth; but that upon their basis I was still willing to go forward with him in his proposals, upon the terms I had made known.

He now declared, that England felt great embarrassment as regarded the immediate recognition of these new states; embarrassment which, he admitted, had not existed in the case of the United States when they adopted the measure of acknowledging them; and then he asked, whether I could not give my assent to his proposals on a promise by England of *future* acknowledgment.

I replied, that under the peculiar importance of the whole subject, and considering the relation in which I stood to it, I could not feel at liberty to take the step upon any other footing than that of immediate acknowledgment by England. Further conversation passed, though only of a desultory nature, and the interview ended.

In reporting to my Government what passed at it, I remarked, that although Mr. Canning naturally sought ends for England in his proposals to me, yet as they were at the same time auspicious to Spanish American Independence, and went hand in hand with our policy, I could not do otherwise than approve of them, and would therefore continue my willingness to give them effect, if he would come to the ground I had proposed to him as an equivalent; a ground, however, which it would seem from what last passed between us, he will not be willing to accede to at present.

October 8. Had an interview with Mr. Canning at the Foreign Office at his request, on the business of the general negotiation.

From the memorandum which I had left with him on the sixteenth of August, he proceeded to read over in their order the subjects proposed to be brought into the negotiation, and after making a few remarks upon each, he professed it to be his desire to take them all up, except, perhaps, the subject of maritime rights. Questions under this head, it was rather the present desire of His Majesty's Government to leave untouched, though he did not mean, as yet, to give a decided opinion to that effect.

For conducting the negotiation on the side of England, he informed me that Mr. Huskisson and Mr. Stratford Canning would be appointed, the latter having returned from his mission to Washington; and that all the subjects would be committed to their hands, except that of the slave trade. This he intimated it to be his present wish to take in hand himself, and thus keep it detached from the general negotiation. I replied, that I understood it to be rather the desire of my own Government that all the subjects, should, if possible, be discussed and settled together; but as he continued to intimate a wish to separate this one subject from the rest, I did not deem it expedient or proper to object, as the result,

if we accomplished any thing, would be substantially the same.

He then said that the negotiation might commence the latter end of next month, if I would be ready by that time, remarking that the great variety of the subjects to be considered, added to other calls upon his own time as well as Mr. Huskisson's, prevented the assignment of an earlier day for its commencement. I replied that I would be ready on my part at that time, though would prefer waiting for a colleague, if I had any certainty that my Government would send one out to me. He said he would willingly wait for that object, if I wished it.

When we spoke of taking up the question of the slave trade, I thought it best to intimate at this early stage, that unless this Government was prepared to say, that it would cause an act of Parliament to pass declaring the trade by British subjects to be piracy, and rendering it punishable as such, in manner as had been done by an act of Congress of the United States, I was not authorized to enter into any negotiation upon the subject. He said in reply, that he was glad to think, speaking from his first impressions, that there would be no insurmountable obstacle on that score.

Nothing passed between us on this occasion on the topic of Spanish American affairs, beyond the information which he gave me of his intention to

send off consuls to the new states very soon, perhaps in the course of the month. I asked him whether consuls, or commercial agents? He said that they might as well be called by the former name perhaps, as they would be charged with the duties and invested with the powers belonging to the consular office. I asked whether they would be received in that capacity by Governments between which and Great Britain no political or diplomatic relations yet existed? He replied, that he could not speak with absolute certainty, but his anticipations were that they would be received.

The foregoing information was forthwith transmitted to my Government.

November 25. Had a full and final interview yesterday with Mr. Canning at the Foreign Office, on the affairs of Spanish America.

November 26. Report what passed, in the following dispatch to the Secretary of State.

LONDON, *November* 26, 1823.

SIR:

I had an interview with Mr. Canning on the twenty-fourth instant at the Foreign Office, when he afforded me important information on Spanish American affairs, which I now proceed to lay before you.

He began by saying that our conversation on this subject at Gloucester Lodge on the twenty-sixth of September, having led him to conclude that nothing could be accomplished between us, owing to the ground which I had felt it necessary to take respecting the immediate recognition of the late colonies by Great Britain, he had deemed it indispensable, as no more time was to be lost, that Great Britian should herself, without any concert with the United States, come to an explanation with France. He had accordingly seen the Prince de Polignac, (French Ambassador in London,) and stated to him that as it was fit that the two Courts should understand each other distinctly on the Spanish American question, it was his intention to unfold the views of Great Britain in an official note to him, the Prince; or to Sir Charles Stuart, the British Ambassador at Paris, to be communicated to the French Court; or in the form of an oral conference with the Prince himself, whichever of these modes the latter might indicate as preferable. The Prince, after taking some time to decide, finally agreed to adopt the mode of oral conference, with the precaution of making a minute of the conversation so that each Government might have in its possession a record of what passed.

In pursuance of this course, Mr. Canning held several conferences with Prince Polignac in the early part of October, in which each party unfolded

the views of their respective Governments and agreed upon the written memorandum or paper which was to embody them.

This paper Mr. Canning said was of a nature which did not leave him at liberty to offer me a copy of it; but he had invited me to the Foreign Office for the purpose of reading it to me, having only since his return from the country last week, exhibited it to the Ministers of the other Powers, and not yet to all of them.

He accordingly read the paper to me. When he had closed I said to him, that its whole matter was so interwoven with our past discussions, written and verbal, on the whole subject, that I could not avoid thinking that my Government would naturally expect a copy, as the regular termination of a subject the previous stages of which it had been my special duty to make known to my Government. To this remark he replied that he would willingly furnish me with a copy of that part which embodied the views of England; but that where those of France were at stake, he did not feel that he had the same discretion.*

I am therefore relieved from the task of recapitulating to you the contents of that portion of this paper of which I may expect to receive a copy. The points which chiefly arrested my attention as new to

* In the end, I was furnished with a copy of the whole paper.

me, and to which I will advert without waiting for the paper itself, were, first, that England declares that she will recognize the independence of the colonies *in case France should employ force in aid of their resubjugation:* secondly, in case Spain herself, reverting to her ancient colonial system, *should attempt to put a stop to the trade of Britain with those colonies;* but it is not said what Britain will do beyond recognizing their independence, her ulterior conduct being left to be shaped, as we may infer, by ulterior events. She claims a *right* to trade with the colonies under a promise by Spain herself, given as long back as 1810, as an equivalent for British mediation offered at that day, between the parent state and the colonies. As regards the form of government most desirable for the colonies, considered as independent States, a preference is expressed for monarchy, could it be practicable.

With the exception of the foregoing points, I recollect nothing material in the paper as regards the policy or intentions of Great Britain, not heretofore made known in my own communications upon this subject, beginning with that of the nineteenth of August. The letter of Mr. Canning to Sir Charles Stuart of the thirty-first of March, 1823, is still assumed as the basis of the policy of England.*

* This is the state paper which, besides giving the general views of Britain as regards the colonies, contains also the full avowal of her opinions on the

To report with the requisite accuracy the views of France from this paper, read over but once to me, I might find a task the more difficult from having had less acquaintance with them beforehand. I will therefore not attempt to do so in any detail, from a fear that I might err; and because I have also the hope that an entire copy of it, although not given to me, will get to your hands through some other channel. I am not able, for my own share, to discern the adequate motives for wrapping it up in such secrecy, and have little doubt but that even the public journals of Europe will, before very long, enlighten us with sufficient precision on its whole contents. The London journals of the present week, have made some beginning towards it.

Having said thus much, I will proceed in my endeavors to state the main points of this paper, where it was illustrative of the policy of France.

It declares that France, like England, considers the recovery of the colonies by Spain as hopeless.

It expresses the *determination* (I think this was the word) of France not to assist Spain in attempting their reconquest.

then approaching war between France and Spain, stating her uniform endeavors with the European Powers to induce them to abstain from interfering in the internal affairs of Spain, and declaring that so long as the struggles and disturbances of Spain should be confined within the circle of her own Territory, they could not be admitted by the British Government to afford any plea for foreign interference.

It expresses the desire of France to see the dispute made up by amicable arrangements between the mother country and the colonies.

It disclaims for France all idea of exclusive commercial advantages from the colonies, saying that, like Britain, she only asks to be placed upon the same footing with the most favored nation, after Spain.

It knows not what there is to be *recognized* in the colonies, as *Independent;* France regarding all government there as a mockery.

It labors to show the necessity of assembling a Congress to which England should be a party, (which she declines) to bring about the benevolent end of reclaiming those remote regions from their past errors, and making up the dispute between them and the parent state on terms satisfactory to both, as the policy worthy of both.

These were the material points of the paper as I recollected them after listening to a single perusal of it. I am sensible that I state some of them in a way to start further questions as to their true meaning; questions which I could myself raise without being able at this moment to solve. The apprehensions of Britain however seem to be fully allayed, at least for the present; and it is certain that she does not now anticipate any speedy interruption of the peace of Europe from this cause. The language which France now holds to Britain, is obviously at vari-

ance with that which her manifestos breathed when her troops entered Spain in the spring.

In the course of the paper on the British side, there is a notice taken of the interest which the United States have in the question. This is met on the part of France by a declaration that she does not profess to be acquainted with our views on the subject. The notice of the United States is in that part of the British paper which relates to the assembling of a Congress in Europe. I might probably have made myself more accurately master of the whole paper, by recurring in conversation to some of the passages after Mr. Canning had finished reading it; but I was precluded the opportunity by the near approach of another appointment impending over him.

Notwithstanding the tranquilizing professions of France, it would seem that the sentiments of Russia, if we may draw inferences from Pozzo di Borgo's address to the King of Spain, which has just come before the world, still are, that the Holy Alliance is bound to keep a superintending eye upon the affairs of Spain throughout all her dominions.

I have the honor to remain,
With very great respect,
Your obedient servant,
RICHARD RUSH.

The Honorable
JOHN QUINCY ADAMS,
Secretary of State.

CHAPTER XXIII.

COURSE OF THE UNITED STATES IN REGARD TO SPANISH AMERICA. DECLARATIONS OF PRESIDENT MONROE IN HIS MESSAGE TO CONGRESS, DECEMBER 1823, RESPECTING THE NEW STATES OF SPANISH AMERICA, AND NON-COLONIZATION ON THE AMERICAN CONTINENTS. THEIR RECEPTION IN EUROPE. DINNER AT THE DUKE OF SUSSEX'S; AT MR. CANNING'S. INTERVIEW WITH MR. CANNING ON THE SUBJECT OF THE APPROACHING NEGOTIATION; NORTH WEST COAST OF AMERICA (OREGON TERRITORY), THE PROMINENT TOPIC. ANOTHER INTERVIEW WITH MR. CANNING; NORTH WEST COAST AGAIN THE TOPIC. ENGLAND OBJECTS TO THE PRINCIPLE OF NON-COLONIZATION, TAKEN IN THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE. INTERVIEW WITH MR. CANNING PREPARATORY TO OPENING THE NEGOTIATION.

The dispatch with which the preceding chapter closed, substantially terminated the correspondence and conferences I had held with Mr. Canning on the topic, so interesting at that juncture both to Europe

and America, of Spanish American affairs. I had further conferences with him, but none necessary to be recounted, as they made no change in the course of England.

The plans of France as regards the new States, which were understood to be fully the plans of her continental allies also, had certainly changed from those which her manifestos implied when her army, reputed at a hundred thousand men, entered Spain under the Duke D'Angoulême in April 1823, on its destination to Cadiz; which destination it reached, over all opposition. The object of that invasion, was the overthrow of the constitutional government in Spain, on the alleged ground, among others, of liberating the King from the trammels of the Cortes.

That the change in France and her allies, was produced by the knowledge that England would oppose, at all hazards, hostile plans upon Spanish America, may be inferred with little danger of error. The certainty of it, is, indeed, part of European history at that epoch.

And now I am to speak of the course of the United States. By the early transmission of the proposals made to me by Mr. Canning in his notes of the latter end of August, the copies of them, as well as of my reports of our conferences on the whole subject, arrived at Washington in time to engage the deliberations of President Monroe and his cabinet, before

the meeting of Congress in December. The Cabinet was still composed of the names given in Chapter IV. of the former volume; and it was very satisfactory to me to learn, that the part I had acted was approved. Although in the end no concerted movements took place between the two Governments, the communications to me, from the Secretary of State, in responding to the overtures of Mr. Canning, were in a high degree conciliatory towards England; and framed with every just sensibility to the frank and friendly spirit of those overtures. This I duly made known to Mr. Canning.

But although no joint movement took place, my dispatches had distinctly put before our Government the intentions of England; with which, in the main, our policy harmonized; and President Monroe in his opening message to Congress, which followed almost immediately afterwards in December 1823, put forth the two following declarations:

1. That it was impossible for the Allied Powers to extend their political system to any part of America, without endangering our peace and happiness; and "equally impossible therefore that we should behold such interposition with indifference."

2. Whilst alluding to discussions between the United States and Russia, then commenced with a view to arranging the respective claims of the two nations on the North West Coast of America, the

President also declared, that "the occasion had been judged proper for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States were involved, that the American Continents, by the free and independent condition which they had assumed and maintained, were henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European Power."

The first of these declarations was probably expected by England, and was well received. Every body saw at once that it referred to the hostile plans of the Allied Powers against the late Spanish Provinces.

The second declaration was unexpected and not acquiesced in, as accounts I am yet to give of negotiations with the British Government will make known.

When the message arrived in London, the whole document excited great attention. It was upon all tongues; the press was full of it; the Spanish American Deputies were overjoyed; Spanish American securities rose in the stock market, and the safety of the new States from all European coercion, was considered as no longer doubtful.

It may be inferred that my dispatches reporting all that had transpired with Mr. Canning, had an influence in producing the declarations in President Monroe's message. It may also be inferred, that the

moral certainty which England derived through my correspondence and conferences with her Foreign Secretary, that the United States would, in the end, go hand in hand with her in shielding those new States from European domination, even had the certainty of such a policy in the United States not been otherwise deducible, must have had its natural influence upon England in strengthening her in her line of policy laid down towards France and the Continental Powers.

As it is now for the first time that I make this subject public, I will give the reasons; if, indeed, any can be necessary at this late day. For, first, we are at a point of time nearly twenty-three years removed from the events, and an entire change has come over the feelings, obligations, and circumstances, creating motives for secrecy. While the events were at all fresh, and long after, I carefully abstained from giving them publicity in either hemisphere; but they have passed into history, and silence has lost its power over them. I do not publish Mr. Canning's notes, which have never been out of my own possession, but have given the essential points laid down in them; leaving the copies of them on the archives of our Government, to which, with his knowledge, I first transmitted them. 2. Being on those archives during so many years, they have unavoidably been inspected for public use; and accord-

ingly, parts of their contents, and those of my reports on the subject, have been proclaimed in Congress, piecemeal, as well as found their way into newspapers of the United States long ago, and, it may be, into English newspapers also. 3. In Stapleton's "Political Life of Mr. Canning," published in London in 1831, the essential matter of these notes to me has already been published, volume second, page 23, and the subject explained on the side of England. What is now published, does nothing more than follow up what was fully opened in that interesting work more than ten years ago, by those who had the just fame of Mr. Canning in charge; and seems necessary in order to make known the share which the Minister of the United States had in the international movement in question; a movement of like concern, as far as it proceeded, to both nations.

It cannot be necessary that I should say more on this head; and thus I close the subject, having given the foregoing general explanation of it all.

November 28. Passed last evening at Count Munster's, Grosvenor Place, where we had most of the Diplomatic Corps, and other company. My wife says, that Count d'Aglie, the Sicilian Minister, told her, that the late King, George III., in talking once to the Dutch Ambassador, called Holland an *aquatic* Power. The King used the term in good humor,

but the Count added, that the Ambassador did not quite like it.

November 30. Dined at the Duke of Sussex's, Kensington Palace. Prince Cimitilli, Mr. Roscoe, (author of Lorenzo de Medici,) Sir James Macintosh, Dr. Lushington, of the civil law courts, Mr. Denman, Mr. Jekyll, and others, made the party.

His Royal Highness, the Duke, uttered sentiments favorable to constitutional liberty, with his accustomed frankness and fervor, Mr. Roscoe seconding every thing of this nature. The former asked if we had any tories left in the United States. I said, a few, probably, in their abstract notions of government. Mr. Roscoe asked, if they wished reunion with England. I replied, that I did not believe there was a single individual in our country who entertained such a wish; we had grown too strong in ourselves. The voluminous and complicated state of the English law became a topic. Dr. Lushington remarked, that no man could comprehend it all, and that it called loudly for revision and arrangement. He alluded to the numerous and increasing subdivisions in the profession of the law, as a consequence of the confusion and entanglements of the law itself, and thought it operated unfavorably upon the profession, tending to cramp the minds

of its members, by limiting the range of their professional knowledge.

Cards being spoken of, His Royal Highness said that the division and numbers of the pack were supposed to have had a connexion among the Egyptians, (he gave cards that antiquity,) with astronomical science. First, the fifty-two, composing the pack, answered to the weeks of the year; next, thirteen of a kind agreed with the fourth part of the year, divided into weeks; then again, four different kinds, answered to the four seasons; and, lastly, by counting up from the ace to ten, then counting the knave as eleven, the queen as twelve, and king as thirteen, you get ninety-one. Four ninety-ones give you three hundred and sixty-four, the number of days, according to some calculations, in the year.

His Royal Highness mentioned that the English Government had a plan for purchasing up the whole slave population of their West India Islands, to get rid of slavery in them. This was new to me, and seemed so to others at table. At first blush I thought it struck all, as very bold if not impracticable.

How far the great West India emancipation act, since carried into effect by Britain, on the foundation of what the Duke of Sussex then said, will result favorably to the interests of humanity in

those Islands, does not, as yet, seem to have been ascertained.

December 10. Dined at Mr. Canning's, Gloucester Lodge. Mr. Planta, Mr. Stratford Canning, Mr. Chinnery, and a few others were the guests.

At dinner, Mr. Canning took less than his usual share of the conversation, leaving it chiefly to his guests. Ships and steamboats formed one of the topics. All agreed that naval science was on the eve of great revolutions and soon to be carried to a much higher pitch than the present or past ages had witnessed. Much was said under this head.

At this classic villa of the Foreign Secretary, one of the suite of rooms, is the library. We went into it, to coffee, after leaving the dinner table, The conversation here became literary. Washington Irving's Sketch Book was spoken of, and highly commended. Mr. Canning said it was a work of extraordinary merit: but he preferred the American pieces. In this preference, others joined. The "Dutch Schoolmaster" and "Rip Van Winkle," were singled out, as rich in humor. The topic changing, Swift came on the tapis. Several of his pieces were called up, with genuine gusto. Mr. Canning was on a sofa; Mr. Planta next to him. "Planta," said Mr. Canning, "pray hand down the volume containing the voyages, and read the description of the

storm in the voyage to Brobdignag; seamen say that it is capital, and as true nautically, as Shakspeare always is, when he undertakes to use sea terms." Mr. Planta took down the volume and read the passage. One sentence runs thus: "It was a very fierce storm, the sea broke strange and dangerous; we hauled off upon the laniard of the whip staff, *and helped the man at the helm.*" When he was done, all admired the passage, under this new view and commendation of it, which Mr. Canning had given us. He himself said nothing for a few moments, but sat silent; then, as if in a reverie, he uttered in a low tone, yet distinctly, the words "*and helped the man at the helm! and helped the man at the helm!!*" repeating them. It seemed as if the *helm* at the *Foreign Office*, with all its anxieties, had suddenly shot into his mind, clouding, for the moment, his social ease. His familiar friends of the circle, even bantered him a little, on that fancy. He declared off, however, and only said that it was a fine passage. So passed this agreeable evening in the library at Gloucester Lodge.

April 23. [I antedate once more in the present year, to allude to an official dinner at Gloucester Lodge.] Dined at Mr. Canning's. The entertainment was in honor of the King's birth-day. We

had all the Ambassadors and Ministers, and, in addition, two Princes of Bentheim, one of them a general in the Austrian service; Sir George Rose, late British Minister at Berlin; Lord Clanwilliam, his successor; Sir Brook Taylor, English Minister at Munich; Sir Henry Wellesley, now English Ambassador at Vienna; Lord Fitzroy Somerset, Mr. Planta, Lord Francis Conyngham, Lord Howard de Walden, and Lord —— Bentinck.

The table glittered with plate; and the glittering costumes of the Ambassadors, was superadded. I sat next but one to Mr. Canning, and had Sir Henry Wellesley on my left. With the latter I had conversation about Spain, where he had recently been Ambassador. I found little opportunity, at so large and ceremonious a dinner, of conversing with Mr. Canning; but was able to make a brief allusion to what had fallen from him in the House of Commons a few days before, on the neutral course of the United States in '93, saying with what pleasure I had read it. He replied to my remark by saying, that he had lately been examining the State papers of our Government at that era, and that they presented in his opinion, especially the letters of Mr. Jefferson while Secretary of State, principles well fitted to enter into a neutral code. The Ambassador of the Netherlands, who sat close by, appeared to listen with as much interest as I did, to this tribute from

such a source, to the American defence of neutral rights.

It may be worth subjoining, that another of the European Ambassadors, and from a larger Power, who sat further off from Mr. Canning at this dinner, sought me out on the day following when I met him at another dinner, on purpose to ascertain what it was Mr. Canning had said to me about neutral rights, remarking that he had caught just enough of his words to know the subject, but nothing more. I told him; adding, that what he had publicly said in the House of Commons on the sixteenth of April, amounted in effect to the same thing.

December 12. Had an interview with Mr. Canning, on the subject of the general negotiation. He asked if I still despaired of having a colleague. I said not utterly; but my hope was so slender, that I could not justify it to my duty to ask any delay whatever in bringing on the negotiation, but would be ready at any time. As a further motive to an early beginning I remarked, that perhaps we might then hope to get through with some of the heaviest parts before the meeting of Parliament in February; after which his own and Mr. Huskisson's engagements in the House of Commons might be likely to interpose delays to our progress. He informed me that the instructions on their side were in daily

course of preparation, but that he did not now think a beginning could be made with any advantage on the score of expedition, until after the Christmas holidays, and that these would not be over until after the first week in January, when twelfth night festivities would be at an end.

He further informed me, that he was upon the eve of writing to Sir Charles Bagot, their Ambassador at St. Petersburg, on the subject of the Russian Ukase of September, 1821, relative to the North West Coast of America, and that if I could previously impart to him some of the views of the United States on this subject, perhaps it might prove useful to our ulterior discussions. I promised to do so.

December 17. Had an interview this morning with Mr. Canning at Gloucester Lodge, expressly sought on his part with a view to speak to me on the subject of the North West Coast of America.

Learning on my arrival that he was laboring under an attack of gout, I would have deferred the interview to suit his convenience; but he had given orders for receiving me in his chamber, into which I went, where I found him in bed, though anxious to see me. His motive he said was, to be put in possession of an outline of our views in regard to the North West Coast, before preparing his instructions to their Ambassador at St. Petersburg on the same

subject. I accordingly stated them. A map of the coast and country, was spread upon the bed, and, whilst his head was raised up on pillows, I was able to point his attention to the lines on the map which traced our title. He went into no remarks, beyond simply intimating that our claim seemed much beyond any thing England had anticipated. I said that I had the hope of being able to show its good foundation when the negotiation came on. Further conversation of a general nature passed on the subject, and on coming away I left with him, at his request, a brief, informal, statement or memorandum of our claim, in writing.

Vespasian when too ill to sit up and attend to business, gave audience to Ambassadors in bed. Lord Chatham when confined to his bed with the gout, received and did business with his colleagues of the administration. Here, in addition, a Foreign Secretary of England in bed with the gout, receives and transacts business with a Foreign Minister.

December 18. Yesterday, before night came on, Mr. Canning's servant brought me a private note. It was familiarly written, telling me that he remained as when I saw him; but that when I had left him, he naturally looked at my memorandum, and, when he did look at it, how could he help exclaim-

ing, "What is here?" "Do I read Mr. Rush aright?"

"The United States will agree to make no settlement north of fifty-one, on Great Britain agreeing to make none south of that line."

"So far all is clear," continues Mr. Canning in his note. "The point of contact is touched, and consequently the point of possible dispute between the United States and Great Britain; but the memorandum goes on,"

"*Or north of fifty-five!*"

"What can this intend," continues his note. "Our *northern* question is with Russia, as our *southern* with the United States. But do the United States mean to travel *north* to get *between* us and Russia? and do they mean to stipulate against Great Britain, in favor of Russia, or reserve to themselves whatever Russia may not want?"

The note ends with saying, that he had given me only his first thoughts, and hoped I would "help him to clear the perplexity of them."

I aimed at this by answering his note, instanter. I said that it was even so; our proposal was, that Great Britain should forbear further settlements *south* of 51, and *north* of 55, for we supposed that she had in fact no settlements above 55; and we supposed 55 to be also the southern limit of Russia, it being the boundary within which the Emperor

Paul granted certain commercial privileges to his Russian American Company in '99. Fifty-one was taken, my answer went on to say, as the northern limit of the United States, because necessary to give us all the waters of the Columbia; and it added, that we had no design to concede to Russia any system of colonial exclusion above 55, or deprive ourselves of the right of traffic with the natives above that parallel. This was the general explanation I gave of the little memorandum in writing, I had left with Mr. Canning; which, brief as it was, had been carefully formed from my instructions. My note concluded with saying, that I was charged by my Government with other views of the whole subject, which, when the negotiation came on, I had the hope would be satisfactorily demonstrated.

Under this date, (the 18th,) I received a second familiar note from Mr. Canning, written from his bed, in which he says that he would take my explanation "like the wise and wary Dutchman of old times, *ad referendum*, and *ad considerandum*."

January 2, 1824. Had an interview with Mr. Canning at Gloucester Lodge, at his request. His attack of gout had passed off. The interview was mainly to confer on the subject of the North West Coast. He objected strongly to our claim going as high north as fifty-one, and hoped we would not

urge it. He said, that it was to the *south* of this line that Britain had her dispute with Spain about Nootka Sound. How, therefore, could she now yield this point to the United States? It was a question too important for her to give up. He again hoped we would not urge it.

The President's message having arrived since our last interview, he referred to that part of it which holds out the principle that the United States will henceforth object to any of the powers of Europe establishing colonies on either of the continents of America. If I had instructions, he wished me to state the precise nature and extent of this principle. He had not before been aware of it. Suppose, for example, that Captain Parry's expedition had ended, or that any new British expedition were to end, in the discovery of land proximate to either part of the American continent, north or south, would the United States object to Britain planting a colony there? I said, that when such a case arose, it might be considered; that I had no instructions on the principle since it was proclaimed in the message, but would be prepared to support it when the negotiation came on. He then said, that he would be under the necessity of addressing me an official note on the subject, prior to writing to their Ambassador at St. Petersburg, or else decline joining us in the negotiation with Russia, relative to the North West Coast,

as we had proposed. The latter (not to join us) was the course which he would prefer, not desiring to bring this part of the message into discussion at present, as England must necessarily object to it. Further conversation passed, as to the best mode of dealing with the principle in our approaching negotiation.

January 5. Had another interview with Mr. Canning, relative to the north west coast. He said, that he was still embarrassed in the preparation of his instructions to Sir Charles Bagot, in consequence of the non-colonization principle laid down in the President's message, and hoped I would be inclined to the negotiation proceeding separately, without England joining with the United States, as contemplated by my Government. I replied, that I was entirely willing that the negotiation should take that course.

January 6. In a dispatch to the Secretary of State of this date, I mention Mr. Canning's desire that the negotiation at St. Petersburg on the Russian Ukase of September 1821 respecting the North West Coast, to which the United States and England had equally objected, should proceed separately, and not conjointly, by the three nations, as proposed by the United States, and my acquiescence in this course. It being a departure from the course my

Government had contemplated, I give the following reasons for it.

1. That whatever force of argument I might be able to give to the principle of non-colonization as laid down in the President's message, which had arrived in England since my instructions for the negotiation, my opinion was, that it would still remain a subject of contest between the United States and England; and that, as by all I could learn since the message arrived, Russia also dissented from the principle, a negotiation at St. Petersburg relative to the North West Coast, to which the three nations were parties, might place Russia on the side of England and against the United States. This I thought had better be avoided.

2. That a preliminary and detached discussion of so great a principle, against which England protested in limine, brought on by me when her Foreign Secretary was content to wave the discussion at present, and preferred doing so, might have an unpropitious influence on other parts of the negotiation of more immediate and practical interest.

3. That by abstaining from discussing it at present, nothing was given up. The principle as promulgated in the President's message, would remain undiminished, as notice to other nations, and a guide to me in the general negotiation with England when that came on.

The foregoing were the reasons which determined me to the departure. My conferences on the subject with Mr. Canning, which began on the second instant, were resumed and concluded only yesterday, that I might allow myself full time for deliberation.

January 21. Had an interview with Mr. Canning at the Foreign Office. Mr. Huskisson and Mr. Stratford Canning were present. It was agreed that the general negotiation should be opened, in form, on the twenty-third instant at the Office of the Board of Trade.

I then handed Mr. Canning a paper containing the following list of the subjects. 1. Commercial Intercourse between the United States and the British North American Colonies, and West India Islands; connecting with these heads the question of the navigation of the river St. Lawrence. 2. Suppression of the Slave Trade. 3. Boundary Line under the fifth article of the treaty of Ghent. 4. Admission of Consuls of the United States into the Colonial Ports of Britain. 5. Newfoundland Fishery. 6. Relative claims of the two nations on the North West Coast of America—[the Oregon question]. 7. Debateable questions of Maritime Law.

Some conversation passed as to the order in which the subjects were to be taken up, when it was agreed that we would begin with the Slave Trade.

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE GENERAL NEGOTIATION OPENS. SUBJECT OF THE SLAVE TRADE FIRST TAKEN UP. DINNER AT THE DUKE OF SUSSEX'S; AT MR. STRATFORD CANNING'S. RENEWED INTERVIEW WITH MR. SECRETARY CANNING, ON THE AFFAIRS OF SPANISH AMERICA. SECOND MEETING OF THE PLENIPOTENTIARIES ON THE BUSINESS OF THE NEGOTIATION. INTERVIEW WITH THE DEPUTIES FROM GREECE. THIRD MEETING OF THE PLENIPOTENTIARIES; WEST INDIA AND COLONIAL TRADE—NAVIGATION OF THE ST. LAWRENCE. DINNER AT PRINCE POLIGNAC'S, THE FRENCH AMBASSADOR. FOURTH MEETING OF THE PLENIPOTENTIARIES. DINNER AT THE MARQUIS OF LANSDOWNE'S; AT THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON'S; AT MR. PEEL'S. FIFTH, SIXTH AND SEVENTH MEETINGS OF THE PLENIPOTENTIARIES. CONVENTION RELATIVE TO THE SLAVE TRADE FINALLY AGREED UPON AND SIGNED. ITS PARTIAL RATIFICATION BY THE SENATE, AND HISTORY OF ITS ULTIMATE DEFEAT.

January 23. The negotiation opens at the Office of the Board of Trade, Great George street, West-

minster. The British Plenipotentiaries, Mr. Huskisson and Mr. Stratford Canning, hand me for inspection their original full power from the King; and I hand them mine under the President's autograph, constituting me the Plenipotentiary of the United States. Their's, in describing my appointment, speak of it as having been by the President with the consent and by the authority of the Senate *and House of Representatives* of the United States. I pointed out the inaccuracy, mentioning that the Senate only, was associated with the President in the appointing power; but on their asking if I thought it material, I said no, being only surplusage; and both powers being found in due and proper form in all other respects, copies were exchanged, each party attesting his own.

It was agreed that all our discussions should be carried on by conference and protocol, with the insertion on the protocol of such written documents as either party might deem necessary, either as matter of record or explanation; and that the business of the negotiation should be conducted in all respects, as far as practicable, according to the precedents of the negotiation between the two nations in 1818. The British Plenipotentiaries informed me that they had appointed Mr. Lack their Secretary.

It having been agreed that the subject of the Slave Trade should be taken up first, I proceeded to

open it on the side of the United States. After making all such statements and remarks on the subject as seemed to me necessary to introduce and explain it, according to the true spirit in which I had been instructed by my Government to present it, I concluded by reading the entire projet of the convention transmitted to me by the Secretary of State with his dispatch of the twenty-fourth of June, 1823.

The British Plenipotentiaries said that they would take the whole into careful consideration. They remarked, that Britain wanted nothing on her part to put down this trade so far as her own subjects were concerned, her laws against it being already effectual, and having put a stop to it as far as laws could. I replied, that such was also the case with the United States; that for ourselves, we wanted nothing further, and offered this projet only to meet the call for a substitute for the British proposals hitherto made to us, but which the United States, under their constitutional system and for other reasons, had been compelled to decline; and also to meet the request expressed in a resolution of the House of Representatives, passed by a vote nearly unanimous, in the winter of 1823. I added, that in the projet I had submitted, the first, second, fourth and ninth articles were to be considered as embodying principles not to be departed from. We ad-

journed at four o'clock, to meet again on the twenty-ninth.

Immediately after the negotiation was in due form opened, the British Plenipotentiaries remarked, in manner altogether conciliatory, that should our labors unfortunately end without any treaties growing out of them, which however they did not wish or mean to anticipate, the failure would at least not disturb the good understanding subsisting between the two nations; a remark to which I cordially responded.

January 25. Dined with the Duke of Sussex, where we had a small party. On rising from table, we went into the rooms containing his Royal Highness's library, in one of which coffee was served. The whole suite was lighted up, enabling us to range through them, and glance at the books. The entire collection was stated to be fifty thousand volumes, chiefly formed by himself within a few years. They are arranged in different rooms according to the subjects. Of theology, there were said to be fifteen thousand volumes, comprising one thousand different editions of the Bible, several of them polyglot editions, his Royal Highness being a good linguist, and fond of biblical learning. The first Bible ever printed with types was in the collection. One hundred and thirty guineas was the price given for

it, and it seemed to be prized even beyond that sum by its royal owner.*

January 26. Dined at Mr. Stratford Canning's. Mr. Huskisson was there, and requested that our second meeting might take place on the second of February, instead of the twenty-ninth instant as first appointed, which was agreed to. Mr. Secretary Canning was of the party, and much pleased with the commencement of our work on the Slave Trade. He had been informed of my projet of a convention, called it a promising "first step," and one which he hoped would be productive of good fruit in the end.

February 1. Had an interview with Mr. Canning at Gloucester Lodge on Spanish American affairs. I read to him a dispatch received from the Secretary of State dated the twenty-ninth of November, 1823, which laid down the principles of my Government on this subject, and gave answers to his propositions and communications to me of last summer and

* This liberal-minded and excellent Prince, died a year or two ago. He was always attentive to American gentlemen, when afforded opportunities of making their acquaintance. None shared more largely, or better merited, his esteem, than Mr. Stevenson, our late Minister to England; and I perhaps may here add, that when the latter was about to visit Paris in 1837, with his accomplished Lady, his Royal Highness, on his own friendly impulse, gave him a letter of introduction to the King of the French not less striking by the respect and good-will it breathed towards the United States, than its great cordiality to Mr. Stevenson personally. I derive this, not from Mr. Stevenson himself, but from an authentic source.

autumn—the basis of which intervening events had changed.

Mr. Canning then mentioned to me the present position of England in relation to this subject; and that it might be known to me the more precisely, he handed me for perusal a dispatch which he had prepared to Sir William A'Court, British Ambassador at Madrid, of date so recent as the thirtieth of January. It was written in consequence of the Ambassador's having informed his Government that Spain had again been addressing herself to France, Austria, and Russia, calling on them to hold a congress at Paris (to which England was *not* to be invited) for the purpose of assisting Spain in the recovery and establishment of her authority over her colonies in America. I read the dispatch entirely through. The substance of it was:

1. That England disapproves of the plan.

2. That she thinks the day gone by for all interference towards a settlement of this contest, unless on the basis of the Independence of the new States; and that she, England, is willing to mediate between the parties on that basis, *but no other*.

3. But that she is nevertheless willing that Spain should be allowed special advantages over other nations, England being still content to stand on the footing of the most favored nation, *after* Spain.

4. She expresses a desire that Spain should herself

be the first among European Powers, to acknowledge their Independence; and that she should do it promptly. The dispatch urges this measure strongly; and intimates it to be the intention of England to wait awhile longer in the hope of its adoption.

5. But that, should Spain refuse to adopt it, or indefinitely put off the recognition of the new states, England will herself recognize them; and that this may even happen in a few months.

Such was this official paper resolved into its essential points.* Mr. Canning said to me in conclusion, that he had no belief whatever that any congress would now be held, and before I came away, expressed anew his wishes for the auspicious progress of our negotiation.

February 2. The Plenipotentiaries of the two Governments met according to appointment at the same place as before. The British Plenipotentiaries had drawn up the protocol of our first conference, which, with some additions to it which I suggested, was agreed to.

They then went at large into the consideration of some of the articles I had submitted on the slave trade. They raised objections to some of the provisions, made queries as to others, and were full and

* A full copy of it was afterwards sent to me, which I transmitted to my Government.

free in their general remarks. I replied to them all, under the lights of my instructions, and such others as occurred to me. Many of their objections and difficulties, they admitted, went rather to the details of the plan than its substance; and they said that they would consult more fully with their law officers, under every anxiety to see all objections satisfactorily removed. We adjourned on this footing after having been together several hours, agreeing to meet again on the fifth instant; but as it was hardly supposed by the British Plenipotentiaries that they would be able at so early a day to see their way through all the first difficulties growing out of the plan I had offered, it was agreed that we should take up the subject of commercial intercourse at our meeting on the fifth; making a pause for more careful examination and reflection on the subject first opened.

February 3. Had an interview with the Deputies from Greece, resident in London, Mr. Orlando, and Mr. Luriottis. I delivered to the latter a letter from Mr. Adams, Secretary of State. It was a letter in answer to one written to the Secretary, in which Mr. Luriottis had asked at the hands of the United States, active aid to the cause of Grecian emancipation. In declining to afford this aid, Mr. Adams, as the organ of the United States Government, puts the

refusal on the ground of constitutional and international duty, not on any sentiment of indifference to the cause of Greece, but excluding such an inference; and I was requested to accompany the delivery of his answer with remarks and explanations of my own, in unison with its spirit—a duty which I gratefully performed. Mr. Bowring, an active, intelligent friend of the cause of Greece, in London, was present at the interview.

Mr. Orlando had lately been President of the Senate of Greece, and said that he was charged by that body, to convey to me its thanks for the interest I had shown last winter in London, in the cause of Grecian emancipation. This had merely reference to an occasion, when I had publicly uttered expressions of good will to that cause of suffering humanity in a classic land,—a feeling common to Christian mankind; yet, in further and over-merited return for such expressions, Mr. Luriottis also delivered to me from Prince Mavrocordato, Secretary of State of the Grecian Government, a letter of personal thanks.

February 5. The Plenipotentiaries met at the office of the Board of Trade. The protocol of the last conference was read, and, with some alterations, agreed to. Mr. Huskisson stated, that Mr. Lack's engagements at the Board of Trade would prevent his attending to the duties of Secretary to the Bri-

tish Plenipotentiaries, and that they had appointed Anthony St. John Baker, Esquire, in his stead.

According to the understanding at our last adjournment, I proceeded to open the whole subject of commercial intercourse between the two nations, agreed to be brought into the negotiation. I did so with the fulness suggested by the Secretary of State's instructions, and the necessary review of all past negotiations and conferences with the British Government, in which I had myself borne a part. In conclusion, after stating what appeared to me the main facts and principles, I offered to the British Plenipotentiaries a paper, which I had drawn up and marked A, consisting of three articles. The first two stated the footing upon which the United States now desired to place this commercial intercourse, and the third provided for our free navigation of the river St. Lawrence.

As explanatory at large of the nature and grounds of the latter claim, after having in my verbal opening stated, in a general way, the principles of public law on which it was placed, I offered a paper marked B, which I had also prepared, that it might be annexed to the protocol.

To the footing on which my articles proposed to place the West India and colonial trade, the British Plenipotentiaries made strong objections at first blush; yet said they would give them full consider-

ation, in the hope that something might be made of them under their own modifications, after having them in hand for more careful scrutiny.

The paper marked B, in support of our claim to the navigation of the St. Lawrence, they appeared unwilling to receive in that light, until they could consult their Government, and requested a delay of their decision on the point, until our next meeting. The claim was entirely unexcepted and new to them—they had not anticipated it. It was so that they expressed themselves, and in the strongest terms of objection to the doctrine I advanced. They asked what equivalent I was prepared to offer for our claim to the navigation of a river flowing through a channel, both shores of which were admitted to be within British territory and under exclusive British jurisdiction? and when I replied none, for the reasons made known in the paper I had drawn up, they manifested increased objections it.

We separated after a long sitting, the British Plenipotentiaries saying that they would give every consideration to my proposals, and the papers with which I had accompanied them. The tenth of the month was appointed for our next meeting.

February 8. Receive a note from the British Plenipotentiaries requesting a postponement until

the sixteenth instant, of our meeting appointed for the tenth.

February 15. Dined at Prince Polignac's, the French Ambassador's, Portland Place. It was an entertainment given to all the Foreign Ambassadors and Ministers and most of the Members of the Cabinet. *******, shows much desire to know how the negotiation goes on; and, especially, if we had got to the maritime questions, and what we mean to do upon them. I tell him that we have not got to them; that there will be a great deal to say when we do, which perhaps other nations may think important; and that, at a future day, I can have no objections to resuming conversation with him on the subject. He says that there are rumors about the extent of our demands. I asked of what nature? He does not know, or draws back from telling; and only refers to our principle of non-colonization on the American continents. He asks if I have understood how France views that principle. I answer in the negative, and express a hope that France may not intervene on such a principle, considering all the circumstances now surrounding it in the hands of the United States; whose Plenipotentiary had to meet the known opposition of the whole British Cabinet to it, and the probable influence of Russia

superadded. He said, that his impression was, that France also had objected to it, or would.

February 16. The Plenipotentiaries met. The protocol of the last conference was agreed to and signed.

The British Plenipotentiaries gave no answers to my proposals respecting commercial intercourse, but ample discussions took place upon them. They stated, and reiterated, the improbability of being able to agree to them in their present shape, assigning reasons at large, and asked if I had no other proposals to offer. I said none, to change essentially the grounds of those submitted; but added, that if they failed, in the end, to prove acceptable, I would gladly receive their counter proposals for transmission to my Government, if unable previously to mould them into any thing myself.

The paper marked B, on the navigation of the St. Lawrence, they objected to inserting on the protocol. They thought it too argumentative to be considered within the spirit of the right reserved by each party to annex written statements to the protocol; saying, that the right, if exercised in this manner, instead of being used as simply explanatory of oral statements, would lead to elaborate written discussions on each side, contrary to their understanding as to the mode in which the negotiation was to be conducted.

I replied, that I was not tenacious of its being annexed to the protocol; but the claim which it embraced, being one of great magnitude to the United States, and new to all past discussions between the two countries, all I desired was, that it be received as a paper containing a general exposition of the principles upon which my Government rested the claim for the United States, and would expect their Plenipotentiary to defend it. In this light they said they would receive it, as I expressed a wish to that effect.* They denied, wholly, the right we claimed; saying that the principles of public law were against it, and the practice of nations; though it was not their purpose, at the present moment, to go into the argument, or produce their authorities in answer to the contents of the paper I had drawn up. There was much of earnestness on both sides, the Plenipotentiaries manifesting equal confidence in the asserted rights of their respective nations as regarded the navigation of this river. Once the British Plenipotentiaries said, "You claim to shut us out from the Columbia river, yet claim to navigate the St. Lawrence through British territory on both sides." I replied, that the two cases were entirely dissimilar, as I would be prepared to show at the proper point

* See Seventeenth and Eighteenth Protocols, when the negotiation had reached those stages.

of the negotiation. This is a brief notice of what passed at the conference on this head.

We next resumed the subject of the Slave Trade. On this subject the British Plenipotentiaries said that they were not finally prepared to submit their alterations and modifications of my plan, not having yet obtained the official opinions of their law officers on several parts of the plan, as they now hoped soon to do. But with this preliminary remark, they put into my hands, informally, a paper which they had drawn up, embracing their alterations and modifications; which paper they requested I would take into consideration, in order that, should the opinions of their law officers be found in the end to sanction it, time might thus be saved. I received their paper with this understanding.

Our sitting was again a protracted one, and we adjourned without specifying a day for the next meeting, as the British Plenipotentiaries could not, under their present circumstances, fix upon it; but they hoped it would be soon, and they would give me two days notice beforehand, that the time might be made to suit both parties.

February 28. Dined at the Marquis of Lansdowne's, where I met Admiral Sir Edward Codrington. He told me that he was at the battle of New Orleans, and related some particulars of it. He

knew Mr. Edward Livingston, one of General Jackson's aid's, and since, our Minister to France. Coming on board the fleet on business from General Jackson, he was detained several days by Admiral Cockburn, and carried to Mobile. Sir Edward remarked, that his conversation and whole bearing, made a highly favorable impression on the British officers; of which all would be sure who knew Mr. Livingston, his talents, and his train of gentlemanly qualities.

February 29. Dined at the Duke of Wellington's. We had several of the Diplomatic Corps and their ladies, my wife among the latter, and other company. Of the number was Mr. Secretary Canning, with whom I conversed. He was very cordial; probably the more so, from the points of difference which seem to be unfolding themselves in the negotiation; of which, however, we did not speak on this occasion.

The Duke's sideboard was full of lustre. The most prominent piece of plate upon it, this evening, was the celebrated shield, a present to him from the city of London. It is of solid gold. On it are represented, in base relief, and in alto, the most important of his victories. The cost of this magnificent present was stated to me, by one of the company, to have

been fifteen thousand pounds sterling. Virgil, in the first book of the Eneid, has almost described it:

> On Tyrian carpets, richly wrought, they dine,
> With loads of massy plate, the sideboards shine;
> And antique vases, all of gold embossed,
> (The gold itself inferior to the cost
> Of curious work) where on the sides were seen,
> The fights and figures of illustrious men,
> From their first founder to the present Queen.

March 6. Dined at Mr. Peel's, Home Secretary of State since the resignation of Lord Sidmouth. We had nearly all the Diplomatic Corps, and other guests. In the table ornaments, you saw the alliance of taste with wealth. When Mr. Adams returned to Washington, in 1817, from the English mission, he was accustomed to say, speaking of the public men of England, that for extensive education and knowledge, combined with superior endowments and effective oratory, he regarded Mr. Peel as first amongst those then advancing into renown—an opinion remarkably sustained by the result; and all who have read the speech of Sir Robert Peel, on his inauguration into the office of Lord Rector of the University of Glasgow in 1837, may see in it, that his mind is not less thoroughly imbued with the spirit of all that is chaste and elegant in literature, than stored with those solid and manifold acquirements of the statesman, which have given him, as Premier of England, a mastery over public affairs

in their largest range and combinations. This—as a reminiscence of more than a quarter of a century. I return to my proper date.

The conversation at table had, as one topic, the reforms in the law, a subject which Parliament had taken up, and with which Mr. Peel has had so much to do. In alluding to it this evening, his incidental and brief remarks told the listener how able he was to look at the law as a science, through the lights of his general reading in that and other fields; and therefore qualified to take hold of it with an enlightened as well as reforming hand, though no professional man.

Prince Polignac, French Ambassador, was of the company. While in the drawing rooms after dinner, I had conversation with him on the relations between France and the United States. It had not proceeded far, when he alluded to Lafayette's intended visit to the United States, and in a tone of complaint; friendly, indeed, but decided. What caused it to be complained of, I asked? how was this possible? "It was the invitation given to him by our Government, and offer to send a frigate over to France to convey him to our shores;"—these things it was, he said, which, considering the relations Fayette held to the present Government of France, gave him pain, and would pain others in France. I endeavored to remove this kind of sen-

sibility in him, by the simple remark, that I thought all France ought to regard the visit in a light precisely the reverse; for that if it were possible, by any single incident, beyond any other imaginable, to revive in the United States the ancient attachment to *Bourbon* France, it would be this very visit of Fayette; whose presence once more among us, after so long an interval, would almost rekindle the enthusiasm of the Revolution, recall Washington to us, whose favorite Fayette was, and the times when French hearts and arms were united with our own during our glorious revolution, while a Bourbon filled the throne.

March 7. Prince Polignac visits me. He resumes the topic of yesterday at Mr. Peel's, urging anew his friendly complaint; whilst I enlarged upon the repelling and soothing view of it, held up to him yesterday—but probably with as little success.

All may do homage to the consistent devotion of such a man as Prince Polignac, to his Sovereign, and sympathize with him while a prisoner in Ham Castle; but it is not easy to regard in the same light, the clearness of his understanding.

I receive to-day a note from the British Plenipotentiaries, proposing the ninth instant, for our next meeting, and reply that it will suit me.

March 9. The Plenipotentiaries met. The protocol of the last meeting was read over, and agreed upon.

The opinions of the law officers having sanctioned the principles and modifications which the British Plenipotentiaries had introduced into my projet on the Slave Trade, and which in fact they embodied in the form of a counter-projet of a convention of ten articles, we proceeded to the consideration and discussion of them at large. The discussions were confined to the parts which I thought objectionable, and particularly to the passage in their first article, offered as a substitute for my fourth article, relating to convoy; and to that in their tenth article, in lieu of the passage in my ninth, by which they aim at retaining all their former alleged rights of search, not conceded under the proposed convention. The British Plenipotentiaries earnestly insisted upon the exclusion of my article relating to convoy, saying that they would be embarrassed by it, if retained; as in their treaties with other Powers, stipulations had been entered into on this point, at variance with those I offered. To this I replied, that the stipulations in those treaties, were altogether objectionable in the eyes of my Government, and could not, under any circumstances, be assented to. I asked, would the British Government give instructions to its naval officers never to stop or detain our vessels sailing

under convoy, on the plea of looking for slaves, supposing no prohibitory article inserted? The British Plenipotentiaries answered in the affirmative. Why not then, I remarked, insert the article, and thus put it on the footing of an international stipulation? The conference lasted a long time, but was productive of no results. We adjourned to meet on the eleventh instant.

March 11. The Plenipotentiaries met, according to adjournment. Further and full discussions took place on the Slave Trade question, which ended in our finally settling all the articles necessary to the convention. I consented to renounce the words in my fourth article relative to convoy, on their essential meaning being retained in the first article of the British projet; and on the other parts of their article relative to convoy, being entirely expunged. Respecting those parts of the tenth article of the British projet to which I had objected, such erasures and additions were made, as, in the end, reconciled both parties. We adjourned to meet on the thirteenth.

March 13. The Plenipotentiaries met. Full discussions having now been had on the subject of the Slave Trade, and every thing agreed upon by the Plenipotentiaries on each side, a convention for the

purpose of more effectually putting down the Trade by the cooperating naval efforts of both nations, was this day signed and executed in due form, subject to the ratification of the Senate of the United States.

March 15. Under this date, I transmit the convention to the Secretary of State, with a dispatch giving an account of all the discussions which led to its conclusion.

I stated, that I had offered in the first instance to the British Plenipotentiaries, the projet enclosed to me, precisely in the form in which I had received it. That I considered the essential principles of it to be; first, that England was to declare the Slave Trade piracy, as the United States had already done. 2. That the vessel captured on suspicion of being a slave trader, by any of the public ships designated for that purpose from the navy of the two Powers, was to be sent for adjudication to the country to which she belonged, and never, if an American vessel, be tried by British tribunals; we, on the other hand, not claiming to try British vessels before our tribunals. 3. That no individual belonging to the *crew*, was ever, on any pretext, to be taken out of the accused vessel. 4. That the capturing officer should be laid under the most effective responsibility for his conduct in all respects. 5. That no merchant vessel under the protection, or in the presence of a ship of

war, was ever, under any circumstances, to be visited by a ship of war of the other nation.

I stated that these essential principles were all secured by the convention; although, in the progress of the negotiation, the British Plenipotentiaries had objected so strongly to some of them, that the convention had well nigh fallen through under their objections; that if in the details necessary to give validity to these cardinal principles, I had, in some instances, yielded up my own phraseology in favor of theirs, and in some other respects at last acceded to their views on points which I did not deem essential, and where their argument seemed entitled to attention, they still reminded me that the preponderance of concession was largely on the British side, taking the convention as a whole.

My dispatch was sufficiently full on all the points; but I here make no other references to it than the above, as embracing condensed allusions to the parts most material. The documents of the negotiation, as well as the convention itself, have been long since published; but as the latter fell through from the Senate of the United States having annexed to the ratification of it, modifications and exceptions which, in the end, did not prove acceptable to England, I do not think it necessary to insert in this work either the documents or convention. The less, as there is

now an existing arrangement between the two Governments for naval cooperation with a view to the suppression of the Slave Trade, in the eighth article of the treaty of Washington of August 1842, to which I have already referred in this volume.

In ratifying the convention, the Senate excepted from its provisions, the second article, and a portion of the seventh. These were introduced by the British into their projet, and I finally gave my assent to them in the progress of the discussions. They consisted in the opinion of my Government, of provisions unessential to the great objects of the convention, and need not now be stated, as England herself ultimately yielded them; and would have joined in the ratification of the convention, although the Senate had expunged them.

But the striking out of a provision from the *first* article, was a measure which proved fatal to the instrument in the eyes of England.

That article commenced thus: "The commanders and commissioned officers of each of the two high contracting parties, duly authorized, under the regulations and instructions of their respective Governments, to cruise on the coasts of Africa, *of America*, and of the West Indies, for the suppression of the Slave Trade, shall be empowered, under the conditions, limitations, and restrictions hereinafter specified," &c. &c.

The Senate struck from this article the words "*of America.*"

With the above exceptions, the convention received the full ratification of the Senate; that body simply adding a clause by which each party was to be left at liberty to renounce the convention, on giving six months notice to the other; to which England had no objection.

The fatally objectionable words in the first article, were in the projet I first submitted, prepared at Washington. In striking them out, the Senate probably had in view the Coast of the United States; though the words embraced all South America, with the Coast of Brazil. But on no part of the coast of the United States, was there any probability that slave trading vessels would ever be found, unless within the Gulf of Mexico; so that the necessity for the guarded exercise of the authority to capture, would have been no greater, than upon, or proximate to, the coast of Europe.

Before the convention finally fell to the ground, Mr. Canning sounded me as to the plan of a qualified restoration of the words struck from the first article, so as to restrict the right of cruising to the *Southern* coast of the United States, as the part alone where slavery was found. I replied at once, that it would be decidedly objectionable, as carrying an appearance I was sure he could not intend, of our

being a divided nation. He rejoined, that he could have no such thought, having only thrown out the suggestion in his anxiety to save the convention from destruction.

England had no solid foundation for complaint at the refusal of the Senate to ratify the convention as signed in London. She knew it to be a fundamental provision of our constitution, that no treaty was finally valid until it receives the sanction of that body. My full power to negotiate, a copy of which her Plenipotentiaries were in possession of, stated that whatever treaty or convention I concluded, was to be transmitted to the President for his final ratification, "*by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States.*"

Yet, it is not to be disguised that she was disappointed at the result: First, because the words which the Senate struck from the first article, and which alone, in the end, had been the means of destroying the convention, were introduced *in our own projet*, prepared under the eye of the executive government of the United States at Washington. To this it was answered that the Senate had differed from the President; a difference not to have been foreknown, and no more than a natural occurrence under our constitutional forms, although it may not have been frequent in the case of treaties. And, secondly, because we had made it a sine qua non to entering upon the negotia-

tion, that England should declare the Slave Trade piracy by act of Parliament; which she accordingly did. To this we answered, that whatever appearance of concession beforehand, this might carry, England had an independent moral ground on which to rest her act of Parliament, in the acknowledged enormity of the offence which it denounced as piracy; the laws of the United States having also previously branded it with the same guilt.

I add, in conclusion, on this head of the general negotiation, that President Monroe was prepared to have ratified the convention exactly as I had signed it in London; of which I informed the British Government; and he was pleased to convey to me, in the same dispatch in which this was declared, (one from the Secretary of State of the twenty-ninth of May, 1824,) his approbation of the course I had pursued in the negotiation of it.

CHAPTER XXV.

THE NEGOTIATION PROCEEDS UNDER ITS OTHER HEADS. CHARACTERISTICS OF THESE, INCLUDING UNSETTLED MARITIME QUESTIONS — PRIVATEERING — IMPRESSMENT — AND THE OREGON QUESTION. FINAL REPORT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE COURSE AND TERMINATION OF THE WHOLE NEGOTIATION. OREGON QUESTION THEN FIRST DISCUSSED AT LARGE BETWEEN THE TWO NATIONS. CONFLICTING VIEWS OF EACH STATED.

In the succinct, but I would hope intelligible, account, given in the foregoing chapter, of the fate of the Slave Trade Convention, only one subject of a complicated negotiation was disposed of. Six others remained, all of importance to the two countries, and some involving great interests of humanity and policy not less dear and permanent, and wider in scope, than those involved in the Slave Trade. To treat of such subjects with the necessary fullness of investigation, under all other calls upon the time of the British negotiators and my own, (for the current business of the Legation went on,) occupied the remainder of the spring and two

months of the summer; the final conferences running into the closing days of July. Twenty-six formal protocols were drawn up; and the intervals between the meetings at which the matter of them was canvassed and settled as authentic records of the negotiation, did not pass without toil on the part of the negotiators.

I made detached reports from time to time of its progress, having kept full minutes of every thing; but waited until its close for the transmission of a connected report of the whole, condensed and arranged from those minutes in ways which aimed at making the whole intelligible under one view. That report was dated on the twelfth of August, 1824, and was published by Congress. Having already given partial extracts from some of these minutes serving to show the spirit in which the negotiation on some of its points opened, and the forms under which it moved along, I now design to depart from that mode; which, if continued, and the minutes were given in full, might become too monotonous and tedious. Instead of that plan, I will insert the final report itself; with which document, followed by its essential adjuncts, the protocols, and a memorandum or two, made afterwards, this volume will close.

The negotiation was one of such extent, and embraced subjects of such magnitude, that its connected history can scarcely be without some share of inte-

rest; and perhaps its exhibition in these pages may invest it with some chance of being more known, than if left to be ascertained from separate, and numerous official documents, piled away among the records of our Government; oftentimes, too, needing elucidation which the documents themselves do not afford. Some of the subjects were founded in the most expanded views and lofty patriotism. My share in this negotiation, was simply that of having aimed at fulfilling faithfully the instructions under which I acted, and I seek no other merit; but let its history duly speak to all American citizens, the merit of the Government of the United States at that epoch. Let its history convey the just award to that virtuous and honorable man, pure patriot, and wise chief magistrate, James Monroe; whose services and worth, too much overlooked, ought to be freshened in the eyes of his country. A noble-minded man he was, without a particle of selfishness or ill-directed ambition; the constant associate and friend of Madison and Jefferson, and identified in his public principles and policy with both. A man of Roman mould, honest, fearless, and magnanimous; who, having shed his blood in the war of the revolution, and risked it in that of 1812, the official prop of which he was, at the darkest crisis of Mr. Madison's administration, sought, with returning peace, to establish on the broadest foundations the relations of peace, and lessen

the calamities of future wars, when wars were to come. Let the just award be given to his Secretary of State, Mr. Adams; whose extraordinary endowments and fervent patriotism, are indelibly stamped upon the instructions I received. I do not republish them, as they would swell too much the bulk of this volume; but their great and enlarged ends under some views, and profound sagacity for his country's interests under others, will be sufficiently collected, in part at least, from my report.

It will be seen, that the whole subject of our commercial intercourse with the Colonial Empire of Britain, insular and continental, in this hemisphere, which still remains an unsettled subject, has never been put on better foundations for the United States, than were then contemplated; and that our trade and tonnage, are in danger of suffering, whenever those foundations are lost sight of.

It will be seen, in connexion with this subject, what large and statesman-like views were taken of our right to the navigation of the St. Lawrence, then becoming an international question of great magnitude; though since superseded by artificial water highways of our own, and other outlets and modes of transportation for the teeming productions of our soil and industry, in those vast portions of the Union for which the St. Lawrence, at that era, was the natural outlet to the ocean. I republish neither the

American nor British argument in detail on this broad question; but the nature of it will be seen from my Report, and cannot be without historical interest, any more than the manner in which it was taken up and urged, when believed to be advancing to practical importance, can be without its bearing upon the vigilant patriotism and just fame of Mr. Monroe and Mr. Adams.

It will be seen how prophetic, under some aspects, were the views taken of the North Eastern Boundary question, at that time; since settled by the treaty of Washington of 1842, after it had gone near to producing a war between the two nations.

It will be seen, under the head of "Maritime Questions," a subject of the deepest international interest, and still altogether unsettled throughout nearly the whole field of belligerent and neutral rights as between the two nations, what was then said. And, most especially, will it be seen, how expanded and beneficent, looking to the whole family of nations, were some of the proposals of the United States. It will be seen, how this enlightened American President, holding in trust, and exercising under a high estimate of political and moral duty, the executive power of the *second* maritime nation of the world, authorized and directed me to propose to the *first* maritime nation of the world, to abolish not merely *Privateering*, BUT ALL PRIVATE WAR UPON

THE OCEAN; in other words, that no public ship of either nation, should thenceforth, when war came on, capture a merchant vessel of the other, or otherwise plunder private property; but confine belligerent operations upon the ocean *exclusively* to the ships of war of each nation! Thus, this rising Republic, so often misrepresented and misunderstood, would have led the way, had her proposals been accepted, to this great consummation of benevolence and humanity; earning the gratitude of mankind, in present and future ages, by the most signal triumph which civilization in modern times would have had over barbarism, still left in the legal code of nations, as long as the rapacious and bloody custom of Privateering has the sanction of that code. Nor must it be forgotten, that in making this great proposal, this Republic, under her noble-minded President Monroe, was ready to sacrifice to a moral principle, all base and sordid gains; for whilst the national ships of England were in overpowering number to her own, *privateering* was an arm with which she was fully able to cope with England, under all the bad temptations to its use, which the rich commerce of England affords, and which her convoys have never been able to shelter from the daring enterprise and swift wings of American Privateers.

It will be distinctly seen also, what passed on the Oregon Question in this negotiation, in addition to

the disclosures already given at its opening stages. This is a question not only still undecided, but, at the present time, intensely engaging attention in both countries, and the whole past history of which cannot therefore be without interest. It will be seen, that it was only then that the two countries, for the first time, fully opened themselves to each other upon this question of territorial limits.

It will be seen how wide asunder were their opinions, arguments, and expectations; thence suggesting to each, the wisdom of giving a respectful consideration to each other's convictions; for I cannot pass this subject over without saying, that, thoroughly convinced as I was, and have ever remained, of the superiority of our title, and sincerely as I strove to demonstrate it, I believe that the British Plenipotentiaries were as sincerely satisfied that theirs was best, to as much as they claimed. How could the Plenipotentiary of a civilized and enlightened Nation, meet, face to face in discussion, the Plenipotentiaries of another great Nation; men possessing and deserving the confidence of that Nation; men of integrity, of truth, of intelligence; and, day by day, witness the earnest endeavors, and calm yet confident tone, with which they urged what they believed to be the rights of that Nation; how could he impeach and deny the sincerity of such Plenipotentiaries—without exposing his own conduct to be dealt with in the same way?

In believing therefore, that the British Plenipotentiaries spoke sincerely what they thought, and acted up to the duty which bound them to their country, I merely render them the simple justice due from man to man, and most especially due from nation to nation, where decided differences of opinion exist. Else, we break down all barriers of mutual respect in the world: else, we appeal at once to the sword, instead of pausing for those other modes of adjustment which the wisdom, the humanity, and the policy of civilized mankind in all ages, have prescribed.

Other subjects came into the negotiation which, if secondary in importance to some of the foregoing, belong to the history of our foreign relations, and are not unworthy to be known.

Many and anxious were the hours devoted to this negotiation. Its long road was often rugged. The discussions were between two Nations, neither of which, from the characteristics of a common race, is quick to yield; yet, there was always this of consolation—that the ruggedness of the road, never interrupted the personal harmony of the negotiators, one of whom, I may here add, has since gone to his great account by a sudden and tragical end.* The ques-

* Mr. Huskisson was killed by an accident at the ceremony of opening the Liverpool and Manchester Rail Road; a public work of which he was the great champion in the House of Commons, and had urged successfully through, over much early opposition.

tions all had reference to the past or future. No actual suffering, no existing irritations of practice, were then upon us, in connexion with any of them. This was favorable to their calm consideration and discussion. Social and hospitable intercourse was maintained between the Plenipotentiaries, and would often agreeably step in, after we had been dwelling upon protocols and other points, hard to be arranged in the midst of antagonistic opinions and arguments, and under responsibilities felt equally and anxiously on both sides. Never was this kind of intercourse more agreeable or refreshing, than when the scene of it was Gloucester Lodge.

Without further remark, I proceed to the insertion of the report of which I have been speaking.

No. 10.

LONDON, *August 12th*, 1824.

SIR: My letter of the 2d of this month will have informed you that the negotiations in which I had so long been engaged with this Government had come to a close, but without any treaty, or other arrangement, having been concluded, on any of the subjects which had been given in charge to me. This is a result which I should lament the more, did I not endeavor to reconcile myself to it by the reflection, that I have earnestly, though fruitlessly, striven to render it more auspicious, and by the consideration, far more important, that, as several of the subjects discussed have been both of novelty and magnitude between the two Nations, my Government will have the opportunity of being put in more full and accurate possession of the sentiments of this Gov-

ernment, prior to the conclusion, or to the proposal anew, of any definite or final stipulations.

The task of reporting to you for the information of the President, the whole progress of the negotiation, now devolves upon me. I enter upon it in the anxious hope that, whilst shunning a prolixity that might fatigue, I may nevertheless omit nothing necessary to a full understanding of all that has passed. I console myself with the recollection, that the protocols and other papers which will be transmitted to you, will mainly delineate every material occurrence. From these may be learned all the formal proposals that have been made on the one side or on the other; but the grounds of them, the discussions by which they were sustained or opposed, together with various explanations which the written memorials of the negotiation, wearing for the most part the character of abstracts only, do not indicate, these it becomes my duty to make you also acquainted with in every essential particular. It must be my purpose to fulfil this duty in the course of the present dispatch.

It was my first intention to have made my report to you in the shape of separate communications, allotting a distinct one to each subject, that I might be able to follow in this respect the example of your instructions to me. But after the discussions were opened, it was often found impracticable to keep the subjects distinct. More than one subject, or branches of more than one, would sometimes engage our conferences on the same day, superinducing the necessity of mixing them up in one and the same protocol. For this reason, and because also the British Plenipotentiaries in some instances established a connexion between subjects where, as I thought, none regularly had place, and so treated them in our records in the manner I shall have occasion to describe, it has appeared to me most conducive to good order to present the whole under one view. If this unity

in my report would not appear at first sight to be suggested by a view of the diversity as well as number of its subjects, it has seemed to me upon the whole to adapt itself best to the course which the negotiation actually took, both in the oral discussions, and in the entries upon the protocols; and that it will become most intelligible, whether in its incidents or its general spirit, when exhibited as a whole. In the hope that this mode of making up my report may meet your approbation, I proceed, without more of introduction, to its proper business.

I. West India Trade. After the slave trade question had been disposed of, the subject upon which we next entered, was that of the commercial intercourse between the United States, and the British colonial ports in the West Indies and North America. Copious as this subject was found to be when examined in all its details, its mere discussion, I mean the strictly commercial parts, was perhaps attended with less difficulty, than that of some others. It had been familiar to the past and even recent discussions of the two governments; so much so, that, upon almost every point connected with it, opinions had been expressed by both. When, at an early stage, the British plenipotentiaries said, that, after the opening of this trade to the vessels of the United States, by the act of Parliament of the 24th June, 1822, it had not been expected by Great Britain, that our foreign tonnage duty, and additional impost, would continue to be levied upon their vessels, I naturally replied, that, to whatever other observations the policy of the United States, might be open in this respect, it could scarcely be said to have been unexpected, as, upon at least two occasions since I had been their organ at this Court, they had expressly declined acceding by compact to the very terms in regard to this trade, which were afterwards moulded into the act of Parliament. Your instructions being precise and

full upon this head, I caused them to be well understood. I recapitulated the history of the negotiations that led to the convention of the twentieth of October, 1818, in all those parts of it which had relation to the question of commercial intercourse. I presented the review of all the legislative acts, or other measures affecting this intercourse, as well prior as subsequent to that convention. On the side of Great Britain; the act of Parliament of July, 1812, the draft of the four articles submitted by Lord Castlereagh, in 1817, the act of Parliament of May, 1818, and the order of council which followed it on the twenty-seventh of the same month. On the side of the United States; the act of Congress of the third of March, 1815, (the legislative basis of their system of reciprocity,) the two acts, original and supplementary, of April the eighteenth, 1818, and May the fifteenth, 1820, concerning navigation; the act of May the sixth, 1822, with the President's proclamation of the 24th of August, founded upon that act; to all these I referred, in connexion, also, with the second negotiation of June, and September, 1819, when the proposals again submitted by me on behalf of the United States for regulating this intercourse by treaty, were again rejected by Great Britain. The deduction I made from the whole was, that the United States had, with uniform consistency and steadiness, pursued a course in regard to this trade, which aimed at placing it upon a footing of entire reciprocity; that they asked nothing more, but, in justice to their citizens, could be satisfied with nothing less.

To work out this reciprocity, seemed, however, not to be an easy task, I remarked, on the side of Great Britain, whatever had been her desire. Her commercial system was of long standing, and, from its great extent, often in no slight degree complicated and intricate. It was marked not only by a diversity in its operation upon her home and colonial

empire, but by subdivided diversities in its application to her colonies. In some of her West India Islands, for example, there were export duties, in others none. Some had port charges, and various other local charges, operating upon vessels or their cargoes, not recognized in others; but, what was more important than all, her ancient navigation acts still remained substantially in force, mingling their fetters with all her modern legislation upon the same subject. Her commercial and navigating system, whatever other recommendations it might possess in her eyes, had been rendered by time and her past policy, deficient in the uniformity and simplicity, calculated to place it, in these respects at least, upon a par with the commercial and navigating system of the United States. This broad distinction between the two countries, was always necessary to be kept in mind, I said, in their commercial dealings, and, whatever explanation or excuse it might furnish to Great Britain for continuing the pursuit of a course, which still moved in many points, in subordination to her ancient policy; it afforded to the United States neither motive or justification for giving up their claim to the principle of an absolute and perfect equality, in all their regulations of trade with Great Britain.

This brought me to the true nature of the act of Parliament, of the 24th of June, 1822. I explained to the British Plenipotentiaries, that this statute had not, whatever might have been its intention, opened the ports of the British colonies, in the West Indies and America, to the vessels of the United States, upon the same terms as were enjoyed by British vessels. The privileges granted by it to vessels of the United States were, that they might carry directly, but in no other way, from some port of the United States to certain specified colonial ports, certain specified articles of merchandise, whilst very high duties were to be paid on all

such of those articles as could alone be the subjects of a profitable trade. British vessels, on the other hand, possessed the additional and exclusive privilege of carrying the same articles to the same colonial ports, directly or indirectly, and free from all duty whatever, when carried from a British colony in North America, to a British colony in the West Indies. Moreover, I observed, the vessels of the United States, admitted only as above to the colonial ports, were obliged, supposing they obtained a cargo, to return directly to the United States, and to give bond, under a heavy penalty, for landing it at the port for which it was entered, with the additional burden, not imposed by the act of Parliament, but existing in fact, of paying a colonial export duty of four or five per cent, upon the value of this return cargo. This burden did not fall upon British vessels, as they might avoid it by going, which they were free to do, to any port of the British dominions, either in Europe or America, a range not allowed to the vessels of the United States. Nor were the British vessels required to give any export bond for landing the articles at the port for which entered, and producing within twelve months a certificate of this fact, a condition which was also attached to American vessels. It was evident, I insisted, from the foregoing recapitulation, that vessels of the United States, had not the same privilege under this act of Parliament with British vessels, and that the former were, also, subject to restrictions, imposed by the act or otherwise existing, from which the latter were exempt.

I reminded the British Plenipotentiaries, however, that no sooner had the knowledge of this act of Parliament reached the United States, than the President, exercising, without the least delay, the authority with which by anticipation he had been invested, issued his proclamation, of the twenty-fourth of August, 1822, opening the ports of the United

States *generally* to British vessels coming from any of the ports *enumerated* in the British act, an exercise of authority in a high degree liberal, considering the relative state of the statutes of the two countries then in force for the regulation of this trade. In other respects, the proclamation of the President had done nothing more, I said, than lay British vessels coming from the colonies to the United States, under the same restrictions in regard to their cargoes, to which vessels of the United States were subject when going to the colonies. This in necessary justice to the United States, it was obliged to do, and by the permanent laws of the Union, British vessels continued liable to the charge of foreign tonnage and impost duties. I explained to the British Plenipotentiaries, that, if neither the proclamation nor the permanent laws of the Union, imposed burdens upon British vessels and their cargoes which were the specific counterparts of those imposed by the act of Parliament of the 24th of June, 1822, upon American vessels, they were nevertheless the necessary counterparts of the burdens which did, in point of fact, exist as against American vessels. To their owners it mattered not whence these burdens originated, so long as they continued to press unequally in the competition of American with British vessels. It was to complete the intention of meeting these burdens upon a basis of reciprocity at all points, that the act of Congress of the first of March, 1823, was finally and on full deliberation passed. Its express object I described to be to countervail all restrictions, of whatever kind they might be, in actual operation against vessels of the United States, whether enacted by the act of the 24th of June, 1822, in force under the old navigation act of Charles the Second, or recognised and permitted by colonial ordinances or local regulations in any of the British ports that had been opened. As this act of Congress could not effectuate its just object by applying to British vessels

restrictions which were of the precise and corresponding nature with those operating against the vessels of the United States, it adopted, I said, such as were analogous to them, without, however, in any instance going beyond the measure of a necessary retaliation, but rather keeping within than exceeding this limit. The act of Parliament had, it was true, proceeded upon the hypothesis of extending like privileges to American as to British vessels; but here it had stopped, without imposing upon the latter the same restrictions which had previously existed against the former. The act of Congress went further, and, in according the like privileges with the British act, imposed also restrictions equivalent to those which were really and injuriously in force against the vessels of the United States.

It was in this manner that I fully opened to the British Plenipotentiaries the principles and views of my government in relation to this interest. If I am not more minute in recounting all that I said, it is merely because I abstain from swelling this communication by a repetition of the principles, the facts, and the arguments, contained in your dispatch to me of the twenty-third of June, 1823. With the various matter of this dispatch, I had made myself familiar, and it was alike my duty and endeavour, to exhibit it all to the British Plenipotentiaries, in the most perspicuous and impressive ways in my power, with the addition of such other illustrations as belonged to the subject. I went on to remark, that it seemed plain, notwithstanding our countervailing restrictions, that we were still left at a disadvantage in the competition; for, that, for an enumerated list of ports open to our vessels, only part of which too had been opened by the act of Parliament of the 24th of June, 1822, we had opened *all* of our ports in return, to British vessels. For an enumerated list of articles, which we were alone allowed to export to the colonies, we received, in return, *all* articles

which the colonies found it most to their interest to send to us; and, for a duty of ten per cent. on our articles imported into the West Indies, and, of four or five per cent. on those that we brought away, our laws did nothing more than retain a foreign tonnage duty, of less than a dollar per ton on British vessels, and of ten per cent on the duty otherwise chargeable on the articles brought to the United States in them. It was even doubtful, I said, whether, under these circumstances, our vessels would be able to continue the trade, and it was perhaps quite as much so, whether the double system of restrictions upon which it stood, would not deprive it of all value to both countries. I used, under this branch of the subject, all the topics of illustration with which your dispatch had supplied me, and others which the subject called for.

The British Order in Council of the seventeenth of July, 1823, laying a duty of four shillings and three pence sterling per ton on our vessels going to the colonial ports, to countervail, as Mr. Secretary Canning informed me in October last, our foreign tonnage duty, having been subsequent in date to your instructions to me, no remarks upon it were, consequently, embraced in them. But I considered the duty imposed by this order open to the same animadversions, as all the other burdens falling upon our vessels. If we had grounds for complaint before this measure, they were but increased by it. If we were deprived of the opportunity of fair competition in the absence of this new duty, its imposition could not but augment the inequality. If we were carrying on the trade under every prospect of disadvantage without it, a more positive and certain loss to us must be the result if it were continued. Hence, I did not scruple to say to the British Plenipotentiaries, that it must be considered as giving additional force to all our other objections to their regulations. I had not, I admitted, and

from the cause stated, received your instructions upon the subject of it; but, as our foreign tonnage duty and the additional impost had been kept up against British vessels in necessary self defence against all the anterior restrictions upon our vessels, and duties upon their cargoes, I took it for granted that this new British duty, if not abrogated, would, on the same principles and from the same necessity, be met by some measure of counteraction on our side. In offering such comments as these upon it, I trust that they will be thought conformable to the true nature and objects of your instructions, though not in words pointed out by them.

In the end, I offered for the entire and satisfactory regulation of this trade, a draft which I prepared of the two articles (marked A) annexed to the protocol of the third conference. The first of these articles, after reciting the restrictions upon the trade existing on each side, and the desire and intention that prevailed of removing them, goes on to provide, that, upon the vessels of the United States admitted by law into the colonial ports, and upon the merchandise imported in them, no other duties or charges of any kind, should be levied than upon British vessels, *including all vessels of the colonies themselves,* or, upon the like merchandise imported into the colonial ports from any other port or place, *including Great Britain and the colonial ports themselves.* And, reciprocally, that, upon the vessels of Great Britain, admitted by law into the ports of the United States, and upon the merchandise imported in them, no other duties or charges of any kind should be levied, than upon vessels of the United States, *including vessels of each and every one of the States,* or upon the like merchandise imported into the United States from any other port or place whatever. The words last underscored were inserted only for the greater satisfaction of the British Plenipotentiaries, it being explained by me, and so under-

stood by them, that it could carry no new meaning; there being no such thing under our system with foreign nations, as a vessel of any one of the States, distinct from a vessel of the United States. It followed, that the passage would have had the same meaning without these words. The second article provided, in fulfilment of the intentions of the first, that the trade should continue upon the footing on which it had been placed by the laws of the two countries, with the exception of the removal, by Great Britain, of the duties specified in schedule C, of the Act of Parliament of the 24th of June, 1822, and those specified in the schedule B, of the act of the fifth of August of the same year, and of the removal, by the United States, of the foreign tonnage duty and additional impost, complained of by Great Britain. The article concluded with a mutual pledge for the removal of all discriminating duties on either side, of whatever kind they might be, from the desire which operated with the parties, of placing the trade in all respects upon a footing of perfect equality. Such was the nature of my proposals, for the more exact terms of which, I beg to refer to the paper which contains them.

The British Plenipotentiaries made immediate and the most decided objections to the part of these proposals which went to the abolition of the duties in the two schedules indicated. They declared that under no circumstances could they accede to such a principle; and they proceeded to assail it under every form. The fundamental error of their reasoning, as always heretofore upon the same point, appeared to me to lie in considering their colonial possessions as part of the entire British dominion at one time, yet treating them as separate countries at another. For her own purposes, Britain could look upon these colonies as on one and the same country with herself. For the purposes of trade with foreign states, she felt herself at liberty to consider them as

detached from herself, and forming a new and distinct country; as moving, in short, within a commercial orbit wholly of their own. It was to this, that her rule, resolved into its true principles, came at last. However such a rule might be met, and its application admitted, as between foreign states mutually possessing colonies, and therefore mutually able, in their commercial intercourse with each other, to act upon it, its application was manifestly unequal and incongruous towards the United States. Possessing no colonies themselves, the United States neither legislated nor acted upon a principle of subdividing their empire for any purpose of commercial advantage, or above all monopoly, with other nations, but held out indiscriminately to all, one integral and undivided system. In strict justice, it would hence not be unreasonable in them to expect, that all nations with which they entered into commercial stipulations, should look upon their colonies, if they had any, only in the light of an extension of the territories and jurisdiction of the parent state, since this was, in effect, the aspect which the United States presented throughout the whole extent of their territories and jurisdiction, to all foreign nations. The productions of Massachusetts, for example, which entered into the articles of international traffic, were, as compared with those of Louisiana, scarcely less different in their nature, than were those of Britain from those of Jamaica; yet one commercial code spread itself over the whole of the United States, of which foreign nations, and Britain amongst them, had the benefit, whilst different commercial codes, and entangling commercial practices under them, were seen to exist on the part of Britain. This resulted from the mere fact, important it might be to Britain, but indifferent to the United States, of these codes and these practices being applicable to the government of different portions of the British empire, some of which fell under the denomi-

nation of her home dominion, and some of her colonial dominion.

It was to no effective purpose, however, that I enlarged upon, and endeavored to enforce, by placing in other lights, the foregoing distinctions. The British Plenipotentiaries continued to combat my positions, and to insist upon their right to lay whatever duties they deemed expedient upon our productions going to their Islands, in protection of the like articles exported to them from any part of their own dominion. They said that they would never part with this right, for which we offered them no equivalent concession. They likened our request for its surrender, by an analogy, the force of which, I could never see, to a request on the side of Great Britain, should she prefer such a request, to be admitted into a participation of our coasting trade. They alleged also, that in laying these duties, they had aimed only at making them a necessary protection to their own subjects in their North American colonies, and that they were scarcely up to this point, was shown by the fact, which they also alleged, of their subjects in those colonies not having yet been able, since the trade was opened, to obtain a proportionate share of it.

I had more than once, occasion to remark, that it was not *the right* of either party to model its own laws as it thought proper, that we were discussing; it was the *terms* upon which it would be best to do so, that we ought rather to be desirous of settling. Here were certain colonies belonging to Great Britain on the continent of North America. It happened that some of them were in the immediate neighbourhood of the United States. Their course of industry was the same, their productions the same. If the live stock and lumber from one of these colonies, from that of New Brunswick for example, were allowed to be imported into Antigua or St. Christopher's duty free, whilst similar arti-

cles from the state of Maine, bordering upon New Brunswick, labored under a duty of ten per cent. on their importation into the same Islands, was not, I asked, all just competition at an end? Still more was this the case, I remarked, if, after disposing of their cargoes, the vessel from New Brunswick could take in a return cargo, absolved from an export duty, and was moreover left at liberty to take advantage of circumstances by trading from colony to colony, whilst the vessel from Maine was obliged to depart in ballast, or, if she took in a cargo, do so subject to the export duty. How too, under the weight of this latter duty, were the articles upon which it was charged to bear up in the markets of the United States against the competition of similar articles found in their markets, partly of their own produce, and partly derived from Islands in the West Indies, other than those belonging to Great Britain. It was thus, that I endeavored to establish the reasonableness of our complaints, and to recommend our proposals to adoption. I admitted the general right which every nation had to foster the industry of its own subjects, preferably to that of strangers, but controverted its justice or expediency, as applicable to this trade, a trade that was anomalous in many points, and to be judged of and regulated not so much on any general theory, as under an impartial view of all the peculiarities that belonged to it. As to the expression "from elsewhere" introduced into the act of Congress of the first of March, 1823, I insisted upon the propriety of giving it a construction that would include the British colonies themselves as well as foreign countries, the only construction that ever could satisfy the United States, because the only one that could ever be equitable. Without it, a reciprocity in words might exist; but there would be none in fact. There was obviously no foreign nation, except the United States, that supplied the British West

Indies, with the articles in which a traffic had been opened. To say, therefore, that they should be imported into the British islands, subject to no higher duties than were levied on articles of the same kind coming from any other foreign country, would be altogether without meaning. The field of competition was exclusively in the North American colonies of Britain. These, by their position and all their local peculiarities, were fairly to be considered as another country in the estimate of this trade, though they were, it was true, in political subjection to Great Britain. Their being dependencies, altered not those physical and geographical characteristics in them, which made them the rivals in this intercourse, and the only rivals of the United States.

The British Plenipotentiaries yielded to none of this reasoning. They admitted that there were many difficulties in the way of a satisfactory adjustment of the shipping question, and of this intercourse generally, between Great Britain and the United States. These difficulties were partly colonial, partly the result of their old navigation laws, and partly springing from the nature of the British North American trade, which bore so close an affinity to some portion of the trade of the United States. But they continued to declare their determination not to admit the productions of the United States into their islands, upon the same footing with the like productions from other colonies of their own; and they reiterated their allegations, that even, under the present duties on our productions, the trade was in our favor. They argued hence, that the amount of the duties, instead of being too high, seemed insufficient thus far, taken on a general scale, to balance the advantage of our proximity to the West Indies, and of the greater extent and productiveness of our soil. On this head they gave me details. They said that, by their latest accounts, full two-thirds of the flour and lumber sent to their islands

from North America, were ascertained to have been of the produce of the United States, and that perhaps seven-eighths of this quantity were conveyed in vessels of the United States. On the return trade, also, they declared that our vessels had a share not much below the same proportion. To these statements, I could only reply, that my impressions were different. That it was true I was in possession of no returns subsequent to June, 1823, but that, up to that period, my information justified me in believing that the trade had not yielded a fair proportion of gain to our merchants. The British Plenipotentiaries dwelt emphatically upon the circumstance of our vessels taking away specie from their islands, in place of a return cargo in the produce of the islands, as indicative of the trade being against the islands, since it left upon their hands their rum and molasses, articles which they were chiefly anxious should find a market in the United States. If it were the export duty that produced this necessity in our vessels to take payment in money for their cargoes, rather than in the produce of the islands, the Plenipotentiaries said that they could not repeal it, because it applied equally to British vessels. It was a duty of four and a half per cent. existing on the exportation of produce, not in all of the islands, but in some of them, viz. in Antigua, St. Christopher's, Montserat, Barbadoes, Nevis, and the Virgin islands. In the latter, it was granted for the benefit of the crown, in 1774. In most or all of the others it had existed, for the same purpose, as far back as 1668. British vessels paid it, they said, when going from these islands, whether their destination was the mother country, or any foreign country. But I did not understand them to say that it was paid if they went only from colony to colony.

To the objection of only a limited number of ports being open to our vessels, they said that they admitted them

wherever custom houses were established, and that the privilege reserved to British vessels, of going from colony to colony, was only the privilege of letting them enjoy their own coasting trade. They seemed to forget, that, by whatever name this privilege went, it was still one which operated against the competition of vessels of the United States. On the non-admission into their islands, of articles that we desired to send, as, for example, salt-fish, beef, pork; these, they said, were also excluded from the direct trade between Great Britain and the United States, including all other foreign countries. Here, too, they seemed to throw out of mind, that this very exclusion, in whatever principle it originated, still operated against the commerce of the United States; for, that a system of positive exclusion formed no part of the regular or permanent system of the United States, and was therefore one of which, as long as they dealt out a different measure of commercial benefit to other nations, they had good grounds to complain.

I am saved the necessity of recapitulating any further, the remarks of the British Plenipotentiaries upon our proposals, from their having furnished me with a summary of them in writing. This was not in the regular course of our proceedings, and the paper not being considered as an official one, was not annexed to any protocol, or referred to in any. It was merely given to me as an informal memorandum, in which light I was willing and glad to receive it, as it protects me from all risk of not doing justice in my report to their representations. It will be found among the enclosures, marked W.

After all that I have said, it may be almost superfluous to state, that this Government will decline abrogating the tonnage duty of four shillings and three pence sterling imposed upon our vessels, by the order in council of July, 1823. Mr. Huskisson expressly brought this subject before

the House of Commons, in the course of the last session of Parliament, with a view to give full validity to that order, doubts having arisen how far it was justified by the provisions of the act of Parliament of the preceding session, on which it was founded. By this act, a general power had been given to the King in council, to impose countervailing duties on the cargoes of foreign vessels, but not upon their tonnage. It was under this act that the order of July 1823, affecting the tonnage of our vessels, passed; and Mr. Huskisson obtained, at the last session, a new act for indemnifying all persons concerned in executing this order, which, though out of the words, was conceived to be within the objects of the first act. A copy of the last act is enclosed. The two acts taken together, now give to the King and Council a permanent power to meet other nations on the ground of reciprocity in duties, both as to vessels and cargoes. To this ground, Prussia has acceeded, by a treaty concluded with this Government in April last, a printed copy of which I enclose, that its terms may be seen. Denmark has done the same, by a treaty concluded in June. The latter is not published as yet, but I have reason to know, that its terms are the same as those of the treaty with Prussia. It does not include the colonies of Denmark, nor of course, those of Britain, standing, in this respect, upon the footing of our commercial convention with Britain of 1815. Prussia, having no colonies, her treaty, as far as there will be room for its operation at all, necessarily stands upon the same footing. Among the colonies of Denmark, are comprehended Greenland, Iceland, and the Feroe Islands, which are enumerated as such in the treaty. It is understood that Sweden has shown a disposition to come into this reciprocity, and that there are pending negotiations between this Government and that of the Netherlands to the same effect.

After the British Plenipotentiaries had finished all their

remarks upon our proposals, I thought it best, seeing that they had not proved acceptable, to invite others from them, in turn, to be taken for reference to my Government. These they afforded me, and they are annexed, marked L, to the protocol of the sixteenth conference. The first article, after reciting the desire of both parties to abolish, reciprocally, all discriminating duties in this trade, proceeds to effect this purpose, after the British understanding of it. It pledges Great Britain to lay no higher duties on our produce, than upon produce of the same kind, imported not from *elsewhere*, or from any other country, but from any other *foreign* country, using here the very term to which, in both the former negotiations, we had objected at large. The same term has place in the part of the article intended to operate against Great Britain, as she only claims, in sending her colonial produce to the United States, that it shall be received, subject to the same duties as are paid on articles of the same kind, when imported into the United States, from any other *foreign* country. To this correlative provision, the British Plenipotentiaries referred, as illustrative of the true idea of reciprocity. I again insisted upon its manifesting the very reverse. It was palpable that the term had a real substantive meaning in the one case, but might as well be omitted in the other. Like produce with that sent to the British Islands from the United States, the Islands obtained, as we had seen, from no other foreign country, but only from the British possessions in North America; whereas the United States *did* receive from Cuba, from St. Domingo, and from other foreign Islands and countries, the same kind of produce as that yielded in the British Islands. Surely then Great Britain would be benefited by the operation of the term, whilst to the United States it must be nugatory. There was a visible sphere within which it would act in the one case, whilst in the other there was no shadow of founda-

tion upon which it could rest. But I was always unsuccessful in obtaining, from the British Plenipotentiaries, the admissions due to us on this cardinal principle. Their second article provides for the actual abolition, subject of course to the foregoing reservation, of all discriminating duties or charges of every kind, whether on the vessels or cargoes of the two powers. The third contains a stipulation, that, in case the trade should prove on trial unduly advantageous to one of the parties, the other will examine in a proper spirit the complaint, and, on its being substantiated, adopt measures in unison with the true principles on which the parties intended to fix it. The fourth provides, that whatever advantages Great Britain may in future extend to any friendly state in Europe or America, with respect to this trade, shall be common to the United States; and that the United States shall extend to Great Britain whatever advantages they may at any time grant to the most favored state, in any trade carried on between the possessions of such state in the West Indies or America, and the United States. The fifth and last article provides, in *consideration of the foregoing arrangements*, that consuls shall be admitted from the United States into the open colonial ports, and received on the same conditions as are stipulated in the fourth article of the convention of July, 1815. Upon this last article I shall have occasion to remark in another part of my communication. The others I leave, including the fourth, upon the remarks already made. The fourth, it is evident, still keeps to the British principle of considering their colonies as equivalent, of themselves, to the whole of the United States, in the arrangements of this trade.

During the pendency of the negotiation, I received a letter, which seemed to me to be of importance, from Mr. Kankey, our Consular Commercial Agent at the Island of Barbadoes. He informed me that, under directions which had been

recently given to the Collector and Comptroller of the Customs of that Island, by the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury, vessels of the United States were permitted to land there a portion of their cargoes, and to carry the remainder elsewhere, if entered for exportation, paying the import duty only on so much as was landed. This regulation, he added, would be of service to our trade, provided the necessity of paying the tonnage money of four shillings and three pence sterling per ton, at more than one of the colonial ports, during the same voyage could be avoided; and he appealed to me to have this effected. I immediately brought the subject before the British Plenipotentiaries, urging the right of our vessels to an exemption from all such double payments, on the ground of British vessels never being subject to double payments of tonnage duty in the United States, during the same voyage, though they did proceed from port to port. I was asked if I had any instructions from my Government upon this point. I replied that I had not, but that I was confident in my belief that, under our laws, the fact could not be otherwise than as I had stated it. Mr. Huskisson then said that he would obtain the sanction of this Government for placing our vessels in the West Indies upon the same footing, in this respect, upon which British vessels were placed in the United States, and would undertake, in his official capacity of President of the Board of Trade, to see that the necessary orders were forthwith issued for the accomplishment of this object.

Mr. Kankey made another representation to me, which I also brought before the British Plenipotentiaries, as pertinent to the business in which we were engaged. He stated that an improper duty was charged at Barbadoes, on the article of biscuit, when imported in barrels from the United States, a repeal of which he had not been able to effect by remonstrating with the collector. This article, when intend-

ed for a foreign market, is packed in barrels, such as are used to hold flour, and seldom contain, it appears, more than eighty pounds weight. But without any reference to the weight, the collector was in the habit of demanding, on every such barrel of biscuit (the cracker) landed at Barbadoes, a duty of two shillings and sixpence sterling, when, by the true construction of the act of Parliament of the 24th of June, 1822, under which the duty arose, it was believed that only *one* shilling and sixpence *per hundred weight* ought ever to be charged. Of this heavy overcharge on a single article, which the exporters of the middle states were constantly sending to the British Islands, I complained in the terms that Mr. Kankey's representation to me warranted. Mr. Huskisson gave me an immediate assurance that my complaint should be attended to. He subsequently informed me that, in consequence of it, the officers of the customs, generally, in the Islands, had been directed, in all cases where such biscuit was imported from the United States, in barrels, weighing less than one-hundred and ninety-six pounds, to charge the duty by the weight, and at the rate of not more than one shilling and sixpence sterling per hundred weight. I am happy to think, that, in at least these two instances, some portion of immediate relief is likely to be extended to our trade in that quarter.

From Mr. Monroe Harrison, the Consul of the United States at Antigua, I also received a communication, whilst our proceedings were going on, of which I apprized the Plenipotentiaries of this Government. He informed me that our citizens, trading to that Island, being often compelled to sell their cargoes on a credit, payable in produce, when the crops came in, found it convenient, if not sometimes necessary, to make another voyage to the West Indies, in order to recover the proceeds of their cargoes so disposed of. The markets in the French and other Islands being often better

than in the British Islands, our citizens, in the predicament stated, would find it, Mr. Harrison remarked, to their advantage to be able to resort to the former Islands, in the first instance. But this object they were precluded from coupling with that of afterwards calling at the British Islands for the collection of their debts in the produce of them, since, should they only touch at the British Islands, having on board any article other than of the produce of the United States, their vessels became liable to seizure. I did not receive from the British Plenipotentiaries the same attention to this representation that was shown in the other cases; nor, under my present lights, did I feel altogether warranted in pressing it upon the same grounds. They informed me, in the course of our conversation upon it, that there was no objection, under the British regulations, to a vessel of the United States, bound from one of our ports to any Island in the West Indies, other than British, afterwards proceeding from such other Island to a British Island, with the whole or part of her cargo; provided, it had not been landed at any intermediate port, and that there had been no change in the property during the voyage. I presume that those of our citizens who are interested in knowing it, are acquainted with this construction of the British laws; which, however, does not present itself to my mind in the light of any important boon.

Navigation of the St. Lawrence.—The act of Parliament, of the 5th of August, 1822, having immediate relation to the commercial intercourse between the United States and the British continental possessions in their neighbourhood, I naturally regarded it, as your instructions to me had done, in connexion with the act of June the 24th, 1822. This brought under consideration our claim to the navigation of the river St. Lawrence. Between this question, and the questions of commercial intercourse under the

act of June, 1822, the British Plenipotentiaries were constantly unwilling to acknowledge any connexion. Nevertheless, looking to your instructions, and as well to the reason of them as to their authority, I treated the two questions as belonging to one and the same general subject. They asked whether, taking the two acts of Parliament together, the United States did not already enjoy the navigation of this river. I said that they did: by the act of June the 24th, 1822, they enjoyed it from the ocean to Quebec; and by that of the 5th of August, 1822, from any part of the territories of the United States to Quebec. But, from the fact of the colonial governments in Canada being invested with a discretionary power to withdraw the latter of these concessions, by excepting any of the Canadian ports from those to which our vessels were made admissible, it followed, that our enjoyment of the navigation of this river was rendered contingent upon British permission. This was a tenure not reconcilable in the opinion of the Government of the United States, with the growing and permanent wants of their citizens in that portion of the Union, or with the rights of the nation. It was due to both these considerations that it should stand upon a different tenure, and the time had arrived when it was desirable that the two nations should come to an understanding upon a question of so much importance.

The British Plenipotentiaries next asked, whether any question was about to be raised on the right of Great Britain to exclude, altogether, vessels of the United States from trading with British ports situated upon the St. Lawrence, or, elsewhere, in Canada. I replied that I was not prepared, absolutely, to deny such a right in Great Britain, to whatever considerations its exercise might be open. I remarked, also, that it seemed already to have been substantially exercised by this act of the fifth of August, 1822;

for, by its provisions, only certain enumerated articles were allowed to be exported from the United States into Canadian ports, and duties were laid upon these articles, which might be said to amount to a prohibition. I added that, although the foregoing act had not laid any duty on the merchandise of the United States, descending the St. Lawrence, with a view to exportation by sea, yet, that an act of the preceding year did, viz: upon their timber and lumber, which made it highly expedient that the relative rights of the parties to the use of the waters of this great stream should be ascertained. I here went into a review of the footing upon which the trade between the United States and the Canadas stood under the stipulations of the treaty of 1794. The memorial from the inhabitants of Franklin county, in the state of New York, and the report of the committee of the House of Representatives upon that document, furnished me with the necessary lights for executing this duty, as well as for pointing out the injurious and burdensome operation of the act of the fifth of August, 1822. The latter act had superseded all the former conditions of this intercourse. With these former conditions the citizens of the United States had been, I said, content; and, it was believed, that they had been found, on experience, satisfactory on both sides. The treaty stipulations of 1794 were among the articles of that instrument declared, when it was made, to be permanent; and so mutually beneficial had appeared to be their operation, that both parties continued, in practice, to make them the rule of their conduct for some years after the war of 1812, until, by the acts of Parliament just recited, Great Britain chose to consider the intervention of that war as putting an end to their validity. This state of things, by remitting each party to their anterior and original rights, rendered it manifestly incumbent upon the Government of the United States now to attempt to settle, by

convention, or in some other manner, with Great Britain, the true nature of the tenure by which they held the navigation of this stream. Such was the character of the remarks by which I illustrated the propriety of adding to the two articles which I had offered for the regulation of the commercial intercourse between the United States and the British colonies, whether continental or insular, a third article, relating exclusively to the navigation of the St. Lawrence. A third article will be found, accordingly, in this connexion, as part of our projet already referred to as annexed to the protocol of the third conference. Its stipulations were, *that the navigation of the St. Lawrence, in its whole length and breadth, to and from the sea, should be at all times equally free to the citizens and subjects of both countries:* and, that the vessels belonging to either party, should never be subject to any molestation whatever by the other, or to the payment of any duty for this right of navigation. After this unequivocal provision, it concluded with a clause, that as to such reasonable and moderate tolls as either side might claim and appear to be entitled to, the contracting parties would treat at a future day, in order that the principles regulating such tolls might be adjusted to mutual satisfaction.

I deemed it most advisable to ingraft upon the article this principle respecting tolls, although it was not particularly mentioned in your dispatch. In pursuing into their details some of the general principles which you had laid down, I was left under the impression that our title to navigate this river, independently of the consent of Great Britain, could be made out with more complete and decisive strength, under the qualified admission of the claim to toll. The writers on public law had generally so treated the subject, and in some of the modern treaties, of high authority in our favor on the general question, the admission was also to be

seen. I refer particularly to the fifth article of the treaty of peace of the thirtieth of May, 1814, between the allied powers and France, where, after providing for the free navigation of the Rhine to all persons, it is agreed that principles should be laid down, at a future Congress, for the collection of the duties by the states on its banks, in the manner most equal and favorable to the commerce of all nations. In adverting to the claim of toll as a question only for future discussion, and one that might be of like interest to both parties, (the British navigation of this river being obliged, in some parts, to pass close to our bank,) and, moreover, where the claim, if advanced on either side, was to be made dependent, on sufficient cause being shown for it, I did not believe that I was losing sight of any principle, of value to the United States in this controversy. The clause, I trust, will be found to have been too guarded in its terms to be open to any such risk.

There was another point, on which I felt more uncertainty. The navigation of this stream, although I believed it could be demonstrated to be the just right of the people of the United States, could not draw after it all its benefits to them, without a concurrent right of stopping at some point or port where both of its banks fell within the colonial territory of Great Britain. Upon what footing was I to treat this latter and subordinate question? Your instructions had not dealt with it, and I felt at a momentary loss. It could scarcely be doubted but that, our right to navigate the river being established, Britain would, as matter of international comity, and as an arrangement advantageous also to herself, allow us a place of entry for our vessels, and deposite for our produce, somewhere on its shores. She has so largely, of late years, been extending the warehousing system to all other nations, for their convenience and her own, that it might well be presumed she would not ex-

clude the United States from a participation in it at Quebec, or elsewhere, at a suitable port in Canada. Yet I felt it to be a point of some delicacy, and, therefore, thought that it would be most judicious to leave it wholly untouched in my proposal. Another reason operated with me for this silence. As far as I was able to carry my investigations into the point, I found much ground for supposing that the right to the navigation of a river under the strong circumstances which marked that of the United States to the navigation of the St. Lawrence, would involve, as an incident, the right of innocent stoppage somewhere on the shores—an incident indispensable to the beneficial enjoyment of the right itself. By the seventh article of the treaty of Paris, of 1763, the free navigation of the Mississippi was granted to Great Britain; but, without any clause securing to British vessels the privilege of stopping at New Orleans, then a French port, or at any other port or place on any part of the shores. Yet the historial fact appears to have been, that Britain *did* use New Orleans as a place for her vessels to stop at, and this without any subsequent arrangement with France upon the subject. The case becomes still stronger if, afterwards, when New Orleans fell into the hands of Spain, the British *continued to use it* for the same purpose, contrary, at first, to the remonstrances of the Spanish Governor of that town, which is also believed to have been the fact. I abstained however, from asserting, in this negotiation, the subordinate right in question, thinking that we should stand stronger by silence.

On the principal question of our equal right with the British to the entire and unobstructed navigation of this river, I dwelt with all the emphasis demanded by its magnitude. I spoke of it as a question intimately connected with the present interests of the United States, and which assumed an aspect yet more commanding in its bearing upon their future population and destinies. Already the im-

mense regions which bordered upon the lakes and northern rivers of the United States were rapidly filling up with inhabitants, and soon the dense millions who would cover them, would point to the paramount and irresistible necessity for the use of this great stream, as their only natural high-way to the ocean. Nor was the question one of magnitude to this part of the Union alone. The whole nation felt their stake in it, the Middle and the North more immediately, but all the rest by the multiplied ties and connections which bound up their wants, their interests, and their sympathies, with the Middle and the North. It was under such a view of the immediate and prospective value of this navigation to us, that I first presented it to the notice of the British Plenipotentiaries as a question *of right*. I told them that they must understand this to be the sense in which I had drawn up the article upon the subject, and that it was the sense in which I felt myself bound, as the Plenipotentiary of the United States, to urge its adoption.

I approach an interesting part of this negotiation, when I come to make known in what manner the British Plenipotentiaries received this disclosure. They said, that, on principles of accommodation, they were willing to treat of this claim with the United States in a spirit of entire amity; that is, as they explained, to treat of it as a *concession* on the part of Great Britain, for which the United States, must be prepared to offer a full equivalent. This was the only light in which they could entertain the question. As to the claim *of right*, they hoped that it would not even be advanced; persisted in, they were willing to persuade themselves it would never be. It was equally novel and extraordinary. They could not repress their strong feelings of surprise at its bare intimation. Great Britain possessed the absolute sovereignty over this river in all parts where both its banks were of her territorial dominion. Her right, hence, to

exclude a foreign nation from navigating it, was not to be doubted, scarcely to be discussed. This was the manner in which it was at first received. They opposed to the claim an immediate, positive, unqualified resistance.

I said that our claim was neither novel nor extraordinary. It was one that had been well considered by my government, and was believed to be maintainable on the soundest principles of public law. The question had been familiar to the past discussions of the United States, as their state papers, which were before the world, would show. It had been asserted, and successfully asserted, in relation to another great river of the American continent, flowing to the South, the Mississippi, at a time when both of its lower banks were under the dominion of a foreign power. The essential principles that had governed the one case were now applicable to the other.

My reply was not satisfactory to the British Plenipotentiaries. They combatted the claim with increased earnestness, declaring that it was altogether untenable, and of a nature to be totally and unequivocally rejected. Instead of having the sanction of public law, the law and the practice of nations equally disclaimed it. Could I show where was to be found in either, the least warrant for its assertion? Was it not a claim plainly inconsistent with the paramount authority and exclusive possession of Great Britain? Could she, for one moment listen to it?

I remarked, that the claim had been put forward by the United States because of the great national interests involved in it; yet, that this consideration, high as it was, would never be looked at but in connection with the just rights of Great Britain. For this course of proceeding, both the principles and practice of my government might well be taken as the guarantee. The claim was, therefore, far from being put forward in any unfriendly spirit, and would be

subject to a frank and full interchange of sentiments between the two governments. I was obviously bound, I admitted, to make known, on behalf of mine, the grounds on which the claim was advanced a duty which I would not fail to perform. I stated that we considered our right to the navigation of this river, as strictly a *natural right.* This was the firm foundation on which it would be placed.

This was the light in which it was defensible on the highest authorities no less than on the soundest principles. If, indeed, it had ever heretofore been supposed that the possession of both the shores of a river below, had conferred the right of interdicting the navigation of it to the people of other nations inhabiting its upper banks, the examination of such a principle would at once disclose the objections to it. The exclusive right of jurisdiction over a river could only originate in the social compact, and be claimed as a right of sovereignty. The right of navigating the river was a right of nature, anterior in point of time, and which the mere sovereign right of one nation could not annihilate as belonging to the people of another. It was a right essential to the condition and wants of human society, and conformable to the voice of mankind in all ages and countries. The principle on which it rested, challenged such universal assent, that, wherever it had not been allowed, it might be imputed to the triumph of power or injustice over right. Its recovery and exercise had still been objects precious among nations, and it was happily acquiring fresh sanction from the highest examples of modern times. The parties to the European Alliance had, in the treaties of Vienna, declared that the navigation of the Rhine, the Necker, the Mayne, the Moselle, the Maes, and the Scheldt, should be free to all nations. The object of these stipulations was as evident as praiseworthy. It could have been no other than to render the navigation of those rivers free to all the people dwelling

upon their banks; thus abolishing those unjust restrictions by which the people of the interior of Germany had been too often deprived of their natural outlet to the sea, by an abuse of that right of sovereignty which claimed for a state, happening to possess both the shores of a river at its mouth, the exclusive property over it. There was no principle of national law upon which the stipulations of the above treaties could be founded, which did not equally apply to the case of the St. Lawrence. It was thus that I opened our general doctrine. It was from such principles that I deduced our right to navigate this river, independent of the mere favor or concession of Great Britain, and, consequently, independent of any claim on her side to an equivalent.

I abstain from any further recapitulation to you of the principles which I invoked, or of the authorities to which I referred, for a reason to be now mentioned. It will be seen by the first protocol, that our agreement had been to carry on the negotiation by conference and protocol. This, the more usual mode at all times, was conceived to be peculiarly appropriate, where the subjects to be handled were so various, and their details, in some instances, so extensive. It was recommended, also, and this was of higher sway with me, by the example of the negotiation of 1818, in the course of which, some of the same subjects had been discussed with this Government. Nevertheless, each party had reserved, under this agreement, the right of annexing to the protocol any written statement that might be considered necessary, as matter either of record or of explanation. In your instructions to me respecting this claim to the navigation of the St. Lawrence, a question wholly new, as between the two nations, you had adverted to my presenting it in writing, if necessary, and I determined under all the circumstances, that I should not properly come up to my duty, unless by adopting this mode. The question was

not only new, but of the greatest moment. I saw, also, from the beginning, that it would encounter the most decided opposition from Great Britain. In proportion as her Plenipotentiaries became explicit and peremptory in denying it, did it occur to me that it would be proper on my part to be unequivocal in its assertion. This could be best done upon paper. This would carry the claim distinctly to the archives of this Government, rather than trust it to foundations more uncertain and fugitive. It would explain, as well as record, the sense in which it was inserted on the protocol. Another motive with me for this course, and scarcely a secondary one, was, that it would serve to draw from Great Britain, in the same form, a precise and full avowal of the grounds on which she designed to oppose the claim. On a question so large, and which, from all that I perceived to mark its first opening between the two Governments, could hardly fail to come under discussion again hereafter, it appeared to me that it would be more acceptable to my Government to be in possession of a written document, which should embody the opinions of this Government, than to take the report of them from me under any form less exact and authentic.

I accordingly drew up a paper upon the subject, which, under the right reserved, I annexed (marked B) to the protocol of the eighteenth conference, and so it stands amongst the papers of the negotiation. The British Plenipotentiaries continued to urge their animated protests against this proceeding on my part; not that they could divest me of my privilege of recording my sentiments in the shape of this written statement, but that they earnestly pressed the propriety of my abandoning altogether, any claim to the navigation of this river, as a claim of right, which shut them out from treating of it upon other basis. But having taken my determination, under other estimates of my duty, I did not depart from it.

The paper which I drew up, aimed at presenting a broad but intelligible outline of the principal reasons in support of our claim. These were such as you had set before me, and as I judged to be immediately deducible from them. Under the latter, I included the argument on the Mississippi question, used by an illustrious individual, then the organ of our Government in its intercourse with foreign states.* I considered this argument as virtually comprehended in your instructions, by the reference which they contained to it, the questions in both cases, so far as each drew support from the deep foundations of the law of nature, being the same. Of this luminous state paper I followed the track, adopting its own language wherever this could be done, as the safest, the most approved, the most national. The only view of the subject not elicited on that occasion, was one pointed out by the locality of the St. Lawrence. I will briefly explain this, as I presented it to the British Plenipotentiaries.

The exclusive right possessed by Great Britain over both banks of this river, was won for her by the cooperation of the people who now form the United States. Their exertions, their treasure, their blood, were profusely embarked in every campaign of the old French war. It was under this name that the recollection of that war still lived in the United States, a war which, but for the aid of New England, New York, and Pennsylvania, if of no more of the states, would probably not have terminated when it did, in the conquest of Canada from France. If these states were, at that epoch, a part of the colonial empire of Britain, it was nevertheless impossible to obliterate the recollection of historical facts, or exclude the inferences that would attach to them. The predecessors of the present inhabitants of those states, had borne a constant and heavy burden in that war, and had acquired simultaneously with the then parent state, the right of descending this stream, on the hypothesis,

* Mr. Jefferson.

assumed for the moment, of their not having possessed it before; a right of peculiar importance to them, from their local position and necessities. It was to this effect that I noticed a title by *joint acquisition*, as also susceptible of being adduced for the United States to the navigation of this river. There was at least a strong national equity in it, which would come home to the people of the United States, impressing them with new convictions of the hardship of now refusing them the use of this stream as an innocent pathway to the ocean. But, as I had not your elucidations of this view of the subject, I was careful to use it only in subordination to the argument of natural right. The latter I treated as sufficient in itself to make out our title, and repudiated the necessity of resorting to any other. I will own, however, that my disposition to confide in the argument founded upon joint acquisition, was increased by the analogy which it appeared to me to bear to the course of reasoning pursued with Great Britain by my immediate predecessor in this mission in relation to the fisheries.* If our title to a full participation with Britain in the fisheries, though they were within the acknowledged limits and jurisdiction of the coasts of British America, was strengthened by the fact of the early inhabitants of the United States having been among the foremost to explore and use the fishing grounds, why was the analogous fact of their having assisted to expel the French from the lower shores of the St. Lawrence to be of no avail? I had believed in the application and force of the argument in the one instance, and could not deny it all the consideration that it merited in the other.

The necessity of my recounting to you the British argument in answer to our claim is superseded by my being able to transmit it to you in their own words upon paper.

*John Quincy Adams, to whom, as Secretary of State, the above dispatch was addressed.

It is sufficiently elaborate, and was drawn up with great deliberation. It is annexed (marked N) to the protocol of the twenty-fourth conference. The intention avowed by the British Plenipotentiaries at the nineteenth conference, of obtaining for its doctrines before it was delivered to me, the full sanction of their highest professional authorities on matters relating to the law of nations, may serve to show the "gravity and importance," to repeat their own expression, which the question had assumed in their eyes. I have otherwise reasons for supposing that their argument was prepared under the advice and assistance of five of the most eminent publicists of England.* With all the respect due to a paper matured under such auspices, and admitting its ability, I cannot regard it as impugning the argument which under your direction, and following the course of others before me, as well as taking such new views as the subject suggested, I had become the organ of making known on behalf of the United States.

In several instances, the British paper has appealed to the same authorities that are to be found in mine. It is in the application of them only that the difference is seen. In other parts, the difference is made to turn upon words rather than substance. But an error that runs throughout nearly the whole of their paper, consists in attributing to mine a meaning which does not belong to it. This applies especially to the particular description of right which we claim, how far it is one of mere innocent utility; how far a right necessary to us, and not injurious to Britain; how far a right which, if not falling under the technical designation of "absolute," is, nevertheless, one that cannot be withheld—these are all qualifications that were not overlooked in my exposition of the doctrine; a light, however, in which the

* Lord Stowell, Sir Christopher Robinson, Dr. Lushington, Dr. Adam, and Dr. Phillimore; and that it was also submitted to Lord Chancellor Eldon.

British paper does not appear to have regarded it. But as each document is now of record, and will be judged by the terms which it has used, and the construction that justly attaches to them, I will not enlarge upon this head.

The British paper aims at showing the indefensible nature of our claim, by dealing with it as standing upon like footing with a claim to the use of the *roads, canals,* or other *artificial* ways of a country; forgetting that the case in dispute is that of a natural stream forming the only *natural outlet* to the ocean, the stream itself being common by nature to both countries. Commenting upon the acquired title of the United States, which I had put forward under the restriction described, their paper argues that the same ground would justify a correlative claim by Great Britain to the use of the navigable rivers and all other public possessions of the United States, which existed when both countries were united under a common government! By a like misapplication of principles I had used, it argues that our claim would also justify Britain in asking a passage down the Mississippi or the Hudson, though neither the one nor the other touch any portion of the British territories; or that it might equally justify a claim on her side to *ascend,* with British vessels, the principal rivers of the United States, as far as their draft of water would admit, instead of depositing their cargoes at the appointed ports of entry from the sea! On doctrines such as these, I could only say to the British Plenipotentiaries, that I was wholly unable to perceive their application to the argument, unless the United States had been advancing a claim to the navigation of the river Thames in England.

Their argument, also, assumes that the treaty stipulations of 1794, exclude all idea of a right, on our side, to the navigation of this river; forgetting that if, under those stipulations, vessels of the United States were interdicted the navigation of British rivers, between their mouths and the highest

port of entry from the sea, so, on the other hand, British vessels were interdicted the navigation of the rivers of the United States, beyond the highest ports of entry from the sea; and, also, that the whole terms of the international intercourse in that quarter, were, by this compact, such as, at the time, satisfied both parties, without impairing the rights which either possessed, independent of the compact, and which only remained in suspense during its existence. This observation suggests another, to which their argument is open in parts which they press as of decisive weight. It alleges, that, because, by the general treaty of Vienna, the powers whose states were crossed by the same navigable rivers, engaged to regulate, by common consent, all that regarded their navigation; because Russia held, by treaty, the navigation of the Black Sea; and because of the many instances capable of being cited, where the navigation of rivers or straits, which separated or flowed through the territories of different countries, was expressly provided for, by treaty; that, because of these facts, the inference was irresistible that the right of navigation, under such circumstances, depended upon *common consent*, and could only be claimed *by treaty*. Here, too, it seems to have been forgotten, that it is allowable in treaties, as well as oftentimes expedient, for greater safety and precision, to enter into stipulations for the *enjoyment* or *regulation* of pre-existing rights; that treaties are, in fact, expressly declared, by the writers upon the laws of nations, to be of two general kinds, those which turn on things to which we are already *bound by the law of nature*, and those by which we engage to do something more. In their quotation, also, of the note from the first volume of the laws of Congress, containing an intimation that the United States could not be expected to yield the navigation of the Mississippi without an equivalent, they seem wholly to have overlooked, besides the other

points of that note, that it was made at a period when it was well known that no part of that river *touched the territories of a foreign power*, and when, therefore its exclusive navigation belonged to the United States, as much so as the Delaware or the Potomac.

The foregoing are some of the remarks upon the British paper, which I submitted at the conference after receiving it. The first impressions that I had of my duty in regard to it, and consequently my first determination, was, to reply to it at large in writing, annexing my reply to the protocol. But, on more reflection, I deemed it most proper to abstain, at present, from this step. As a view of the whole subject given out under the immediate eye and authority of this Government, and with extraordinary care, it appeared to me that the British paper ought to come under the knowledge of my own Government, before receiving a formal or full answer from any source less high. If it be thought to require such an answer, a short delay could be nothing to the advantage of its being afforded, either through me or my successor in this mission, under the light of further instructions from home. The pause seemed the more due, not only from the newness of the discussion between the two Governments, but because I may not, at this moment, be sufficiently apprized of all the modifications under which mine may desire it to be presented in a second and more full argument. I hope that this forbearance on my part will be approved, as having been, under the exigency, the most circumspect and becoming course. I gave the British Plenipotentiaries to understand, that the written argument on the side of the United States must not be considered as closed, but, on the contrary, only as opened.

Finally, in coming to a conclusion on the general subject of our commercial intercourse with the British West Indies and their North American colonies, whether by the way of

the ocean or the St. Lawrence, it may be proper in me to recapitulate what I take to be the present determinations of this Government in regard to it, at all points.

1. They will not give up the duty of four shillings and three pence sterling per ton imposed upon our vessels by the order in council of July, 1823.

2. They will enter into no convention or arrangement with us which does not recognize the principle embraced in the first article of their counter-projet annexed in the sixteenth protocol. I mean that which goes to place our produce imported into their islands upon the same footing in respect of duties as the like produce imported into them from any other *foreign* country. This term they adhere to, on the avowed principle of protecting and encouraging the produce of their own colonial possessions in North America.

3. They will not abolish the duties specified in schedule C of the act of Parliament of the 24th of June, 1822, or those specified in schedule B of the act of the 5th of August, 1822.

4. They totally deny our *right* to the navigation of the St. Lawrence, declaring that they cannot treat of the subject upon such a basis.

5. They will be willing to repeal entirely, if not already done, all duties or charges whatever, whether imposed by act of Parliament, growing out of colonial laws or usages, or in whatsoever manner existing, which go to subject vessels of the United States to any burden not common to British vessels; the repeal to extend to all the enumerated ports, without exception.

6. Though stating that they are not satisfied with the trade on its present footing, they are willing that it should have a further experiment; that is, to let it go on, the United States retaining their foreign tonnage duty, and additional

impost of ten per cent., and Great Britain retaining her tonnage duty of July, 1823, and also an additional impost of ten per cent.

The protocols which have reference to the different branches of this whole subject are, the third, the ninth, the fifteenth, the sixteenth, the seventeenth, the eighteenth, the nineteenth, the twenty-fourth and the twenty-fifth. I pass to another subject.

II. Boundary line under the fifth article of the treaty of Ghent. This subject was, throughout, coupled by the British plenipotentiaries with the subject, the discussions respecting which, I have just been detailing, viz. the navigation of the St. Lawrence. Their reasons for this course will be seen presently, though I did not acquiesce in their validity. I brought the subject before them by stating from the treaty of Ghent the duties which, under its fifth article, were to have been performed by the commissioners of the two countries, in relation to this long unsettled boundary. I brought into view, from your instructions of the 25th of June, 1823, the many and essential points upon which the commissioners had differed; 1st. upon where the northwest angle of Nova Scotia was situated; 2d. upon what was the northwesternmost head of Connecticut river; 3d. upon the meaning of the words in the old treaty of 1783, "along the highlands which divide those rivers that empty themselves into the river St. Lawrence, from those which fall into the Atlantic ocean;" 4th. upon the admission of the general maps respectively presented by the agents of the two Governments, each objecting to the correctness of that presented by the other, and pressing for the reception of his own; 5th. upon a proposal by the British Commissioner to send out surveyors to ascertain the correctness of the former surveys in regard to the points objected to in the maps presented by the agents; 6th. upon a demand made by the

British agent to examine upon oath the surveyors who made the maps, with regard to their correctness: 7th. upon the reception and entering upon the journals of a memorial of the British agent, containing a statement of one of the British surveyors, relating to the maps presented by the agents; and 8th. upon the reception of a written motion by the British agent requesting leave to exhibit a memorial containing statements of the British surveyors relating to the maps, and that the same might be entered on the journals. There were still other points upon which the Commissioners had differed, but the foregoing, as it was plain to see, embraced the chief ones. Neither of the two points, viz. the latitude and longitude of the northwest angle of Nova Scotia, or the northwesternmost head of Connecticut river, the ascertaining of which had been the great object of the commission, having been fixed, it had become impossible, I remarked, for the Commissioners to agree upon the map and declaration, which, by the stipulations of the treaty of Ghent, were conclusively to have determined the boundary, and that, consequently, there was now no such map; whilst, to aggravate this difficulty, the general map produced by each side had been totally discredited by the other.

I then recited those parts of the fifth article of the treaty of Ghent, under which, in conjunction with the corresponding clauses of the fourth article, provision is made for carrying the differences of the commissioners, in case they failed to arrange this boundary, before some friendly sovereign for his decision; but added, that the Government of the United States, instead of adopting this course, desired to *attempt* a settlement of those differences by direct negotiation between the two countries, as heretofore proposed by the United States, and acceded to by Great Britain. Having thus opened our plan, I proceeded to expatiate on the topics en-

larged upon in your dispatch towards its elucidation and support. I pointed to the formidable embarrassments which surrounded the subject on all sides, in its present actual state, regarded as one to be settled by an umpirage; to the necessity which would be devolved upon the sovereign, of deciding upon a boundary of at least six hundred miles in extent, through a half discovered country, which the parties themselves, after six years of laborious investigation, had altogether failed to fix, assisted too, as they had been, by able surveyors, geographers, astronomers, and agents; to the various questions of construction of ancient charters, treaties, and proclamations, into which he would have to travel; to the controversies between France and England, prior to the session of Canada to the latter, with which he must become familiar; and to the immense volume of documents produced by the labors, scientific, argumentative, or practical, of the commissioners, and those who acted in cooperation with them, which he would have to peruse. I forbear to go further with a recapitulation of the difficulties, as I omitted none that your dispatch had laid before me; and, above all, did not omit to state, that, to the appalling train of them would be added, that of the sovereign having to choose between maps that had alike been discredited by both parties. It was to avoid all these difficulties, and the uncertain results that might, and probably would, hang upon them, if the differences were carried before an arbitrator, that my Government had charged me, I said, with the duty of now submitting, in a distinct and formal manner, the proposal for settling them by direct negotiation. This proposal I accordingly prepared and offered, in the shape of a written article, [marked D] annexed to the protocol of the ninth conference. The article, after reciting, that the Commissioners under the fifth article of the treaty of Ghent, for ascertaining the latitude and longitude of the northwest angle

of Nova Scotia, and the northwesternmost head of Connecticut river, and for surveying that part of the boundary line between the dominions of the two powers, which extends from the source of the river St. Croix, directly north, to the above northwest angle of Nova Scotia, (and so on, pursuing the words of the treaty,) had not been able to agree, and also reciting, that it was the desire of the parties, instead of referring their differences to the arbitration of a sovereign, as provided by the treaty, to endeavour to settle them by negotiation between themselves, went on to stipulate, that the parties would accordingly negotiate on them, at Washton; and further, that in the course of such negotiation, they would receive, if necessary, the maps that had been respectively submitted and used by the commissioners of each nation, but that none that had been used on the one side, should be received or used to the exclusion of those used on the other. Such were the terms of my proposal, which I trust will be thought to have embodied, with sufficient care, your directions in relation to this subject.

The British Plenipotentiaries, after hearing my proposal, and the reasons that had been given in its support, though not accepting it, did not object to the principle of compromise. They declared, however, that if ever they did enter into any regular agreement to settle the question by negotiation or compromise, it must in their view, contain a clause that, this mode of settlement failing, that by arbitration, under the treaty was still to be retained as the right of the parties. They expressed their concurrence in opinion as to the difficulty which there might be in submitting differences of such scope and complication to the arbitration of a sovereign, and wished, if practicable, to avoid resorting to this plan. What they desired, under present circumstances, was, that Great Britain should be allowed to settle the several disputed points which had arisen under the fifth article of

the treaty of Ghent, by going into them on principles of mutual concession, *in connexion with the claim of the United States to the navigation of the St. Lawrence.* They distinctly submitted this proposal to me, which, however, was not given in writing, further than as it will be seen in the seventeenth and eighteenth protocols.

To this proposal I made immediate objections, as both new and unexpected. I admitted no connexion between the two subjects. How could I consent to treat of them conjointly, on the basis of mutual concession, when the United States expressly claimed the right of navigating this river, independent of all concession? The subjects were distinct, and would not, I expressed a hope, be coupled by the intervention of a principle wholly alien to the one, and not admitted by my Government to have any application to the other.

The British Plenipotentiaries, always renewing their pointed denials of our *right* to the navigation of the St. Lawrence, said, that they had coupled these subjects because of their affinity under the general head of boundary, some of the disputed points under the fifth article of the treaty of Ghent being, as to locality, contiguous to that part of the St Lawrence which flows through the British territories. This was one of their reasons. Another and stronger one was, that they were prepared to make offers, which they would describe, as founded upon a most liberal and comprehensive view of the wishes and interests of the United States, in relation to the differences under the fifth article of the treaty of Ghent, in connexion with offers of the same character, in relation to the navigation of the St. Lawrence, provided we were prepared to treat of the latter on the footing of *concession* by Great Britain. By having both the questions under our hands at the same time, they urged the greater probability of our being able to settle both, and

expressed their belief that, by thus multiplying the materials of compromise, we might arrive at a speedy and satisfactory arrangement on both subjects. They therefore hoped that I would accede to their wish of coupling these two subjects together in the manner that they proposed.

I repeated my objections to their proposal; declaring that my instructions did not permit me to hesitate a moment in rejecting it. The boundary question was one that stood upon its own foundation. No other had been coupled with it by my Government, and I could not consent to treat of it with any other, where the connexion was confessedly to impair the equal ground of the United States as soon as the principal of compromise was admitted. The boundary question, too, besides being detached and independent, was in its nature, peculiarly ample. The materials of compromise existed within its own limits, rendering it unnecessary therefore to seek in a new subject what was already at hand. The association of another subject with it, and that subject the navigation of the St. Lawrence, would be open to the danger of producing further collisions, full as much perhaps as any enhanced prospect of an easy arrangement. Besides, I remarked, was the agreement heretofore signified by Great Britain to attempt the settlement of this question of boundary by direct communication between the two Governments, without the association of any other with it being at that period so much as thought of,—was this to be overlooked? Here I recalled to the British Plenipotentiaries what had passed between Lord Londonderry and myself upon this question, and at a subsequent conference I read to them those parts of my dispatches of February the 11th, and April the 6th, 1822, which detailed it to you. It was in this manner that I met the proposal of joining the two subjects upon the terms intimated.

The British Plenipotentiaries, repeating their opinion that

the junction would be likely to accomplish results satisfactory to both sides, said, that they had neither the desire nor intention of overlooking any past agreement upon this subject with which their Government might be chargeable. They then asked whether, in case they were willing to go at once into the boundary question, as one by itself, I was prepared to make to them any specific offer for a settlement. I replied that I was not. My Government had not looked to a settlement of the question here at the present moment, by any offers to be made through me. Nor had it at any time contemplated the submitting of offers merely to be accepted or rejected by this Government, but only to be received on the principle of negotiating, and it was to secure a negotiation upon the entire subject, that I had drawn up the article that had been given to them. I had occasion to perceive, that the British Plenipotentiaries reverted to the same construction of their acceptance heretofore of our proposal of attempting an adjustment by direct communication, as that suggested to you by the British Minister in Washington. They did not appear to consider that it charged this Government with the obligation of a regular and formal negotiation upon the point, but only with that of receiving from us, and considering, an offer of a boundary line by compromise, which they still professed their readiness to do. I said that the United States were not prepared at present to make this offer, to say nothing of their objections to making it at all, under the uncertainty of whether or not it would be received on the principle of negotiating; and I labored to show the latter to have been the true spirit of the past agreement. Certainly it was that, I said, in which it had been understood on our side. But, under the turn which the question of the St. Lawrence had taken, I found the British Plenipotentiaries unwilling to give to their past agreement any larger meaning than that to

which they considered themselves pledged by their own understanding of its terms; and although I continued to the last to press upon them the acceptance of my proposal, in the form annexed to the ninth protocol, I was not able to succeed.

They asked whether, in case *they* were to submit to me an offer of a boundary by compromise, I was prepared to conclude any thing under such an offer. To this too I replied that I was not. They next inquired, whether I was prepared to conclude arrangements with them which, in their opinion, must accompany any mere agreement to settle the disputed points by compromise. I answered, that this would depend upon the particular nature of the arrangements. I had already, myself, put forward a formal proposal intended to effectuate, through negotiation, this end. If this proposal had proved objectionable in any points where the option of modification might rest with me, I would willingly take into consideration counter-proposals having in view the same end. Understanding, however, that any counter-proposals from them, if submitted at this juncture, would contain at least some allusions to the question of the St. Lawrence, I said that I would decline the conclusion of any previous arrangement upon the subject.

It will be seen, from all that I have said, how constant and earnest a desire was manifested by the British Plenipotentiaries to blend these two questions, and how constantly I felt it my duty, under every aspect, to keep them asunder. I have stated also, that, on the supposition of their being joined together as elements of accommodation, the British plenipotentiaries remarked, that they were prepared to make offers founded, (I use their own words,) "on a most liberal and comprehensive view of the wishes and interests of the United States" in relation to both. Such a declaration could not fail to excite my attention. I was aware,

indeed, that Britain might make offers which she would doubtless believe to wear this character of benefit to the United States, without the United States being laid under the same convictions, so different an estimate might each party form of what was its due. Yet, the expressions were strong, and although I felt that I could accede to nothing whatever, myself, coupled with the principle of compromise that had been avowed, I nevertheless thought that there might be some propriety in knowing, for the information of my Government, the nature of the offers which professed, and in terms so strong, to bear upon the interests and wishes of the United States. I therefore said to the British plenipotentiaries, that I should be glad to be made acquainted with them, not in a way pledging this Government to any ulterior step, but merely as offers that would have been made, in case I had expressed a willingness to receive them upon the condition from which they were not to be severed. They asked, what progress I supposed would be made towards a settlement by a compliance on their part with my request. I replied none at present, but that I would transmit their offers to my Government, in the light of an incidental fact evolved in the course of the negotiation; and, so far, it might be proper, and possibly useful, that I should know them. They next asked whether I could undertake to give them any reasonable assurance that my Government, on receiving them, and finding them satisfactory and advantageous, would be disposed to take them into consideration under their essential condition of our claim to the navigation of the St. Lawrence, as a *right*, being waved. I replied that I was wholly unauthorized to give them the slightest assurance to that effect. This closed my endeavours to obtain a knowledge of their offers, which, as will be inferred, were, in the end, not communicated to me. In the course of the remarks to which these endeavours led, I did not scruple to express

the belief I entertained, that my Government looked forward with a well grounded and even confident hope to the negotiation on the boundary question alone, terminating, on a principle of compromise, in a manner satisfactory to both nations.

All attempts, under present circumstances, to put the case into an effective train of settlement, either by direct offers of compromise, or by an agreement to negotiate on that principle, having thus failed, the plan of arbitration next presented itself for consideration. I thought, at one time, that the British Plenipotentiaries designed to press an immediate resort to this plan. I informed them, in reply to their own inquiry, that I was prepared, if they insisted upon it, to enter upon the necessary steps for the selection of a Sovereign as arbitrator. I again dwelt, however, upon the extreme difficulty, not to say impossibility, which, in the opinion of my Government, there would be, under existing circumstances, in going on with an arbitration. How, I asked, was it even to be begun? Was this Government prepared to furnish a statement of the case proper to be laid before the arbitrator, and which would, at the same time, invite the concurrence of the United States? In regard to the first idea, I reminded the British Plenipotentiaries of the mutual complaints and recriminations, often sharp and angry, which it was alike to be admitted and lamented, were too profusely to be found among the elaborate journals and other proceedings of the commission, and over which it might be supposed that each nation would rather desire to draw a veil than publish more largely to the world. This feature in the complicated transaction, formed, indeed, one of the many reasons for not resorting to an umpirage at all, and so I had been instructed to declare. But, this objection removed, how, I asked, in the second place, would Britain prepare her statement in a manner to

be acceptable to the United States? Upon what maps would it be founded? Not upon those used by the United States, for to these Britain objected; not upon her own, for to these the United States objected; and there was no common map which could reconcile these discordant opinions. My own Government, I added, would have performed the task of drawing up a statement, but for this difficulty about the map, not the only one, however, but a difficulty common to both parties, and which met them at the very threshhold. It was thus that I addressed the British Plenipotentaries when we spoke of arbitration.

I perceived, to my surprize, that they were under an impression, at first, that no statement at all was necessary, and perhaps, under the treaty of Ghent, might not even be admissible. They quoted the words of the fourth article, that run as follows, viz. "that in the event of the two commissioners differing upon all or any of the matters so referred to them, or in the event of both or either of the said commissioners refusing or declining, or wilfully omitting to act as such, they shall make, jointly or separately, a report or reports, as well to the Government of His Britanic Majesty as to that of the United States, stating, in detail, the points on which they differ, and the grounds on which their respective opinions have been formed, or the grounds upon which they, or either of them, have so refused, declined, or omitted to act. And His Britanic Majesty and the Government of the United States hereby agree to refer the *report* or *reports* of the said commissioners to some friendly sovereign or state, to be then named for that purpose, and who shall be requested to decide on the differences which may be stated in the said *report* or *reports*, or upon the report of one commissioner, together with the grounds upon which the other commissioner shall have refused, declined, or omitted to act." From the tenor of

the article, as thus quoted, the British Plenipotentiaries said, that they rather inferred it to be the intention of the treaty, that it was the *report* itself, as the authentic and official document, and not a statement framed out of the report, that was to be laid before the arbitrator. It was to the source itself that he was to look for his information, not to any thing derivative.

I replied, that I considered this by no means the true, certainly not as the imperative construction of the treaty. The statement indicated by my Government, as proper upon the occasion, was to be nothing more than an abstract to be made, by consent of both parties, from the report, presenting, in a succinct, and intelligible form, to the arbitrator, the points on which he was to decide, and drawing his attention to such parts of the report as might especially call for his investigation. It was not to supersede the report, but to be something in addition to it. The parties were surely competent to adopt, by mutual agreement, such a measure. It would be obviously, a convenient, if not an indispensable form, by which to secure to their case a ready and advantageous hearing. I admitted that I could not advert to the precedent of the statement prepared when the slave question was submitted to the Emperor of Russia, as governing, in this instance; for, in that case, the arbitration had not taken place under any provision in the treaty; but I insisted that the cases were analogous in reason, the measure being designed chiefly, and in this light imperiously due, to smooth the labors, difficult as they must needs be, with every mitigation of the umpire.

The British Plenipotentiaries, without pushing the argument on this point further, now inquired whether, if they were disposed to wave whatever right they might have under the treaty to object to the necessity of a statement, and prepare one after their own understanding of what it

should contain, I was empowered to accede to it, without any reference home to my Government. Here again, I could only give them a reply in the negative. My Government, I said, had not anticipated such a step by me. I had been fully written to on the whole subject, but was not now in possession of the multitude of documents that belonged to it. I could not, therefore, be supposed to be armed with the means of fitly judging of their statement. My sole duty respecting it, would be to transmit it to my Government, and I subjoined that, how far it would prove acceptable to my Government, must depend, in a great degree, on the map that was used in drawing it up. Upon this point, important as it is, I was not able to obtain from the British plenipotentiaries any explicit declaration of their intentions, nor did they incline to take any steps with me towards the concurrent selection of an arbitrator. They admitted that difficulties would lie in the way of their furnishing me with any statement, at this juncture, that would be likely to be satisfactory to my Government, and thought that no time would be lost, by their forbearing at present to offer one.

In the course of our conversations on the mode of carrying the arbitration into effect, I always, as I have already mentioned, held up, in the strongest lights in my power, the numerous, the intrinsic, the insuperable obstacles presenting themselves on every side to a practical resort to this mode of adjustment. Your dispatch had abundantly supplied me with matter for doing so, and I was not sparing in the use of it. Amongst other topics which I advanced, was that of the full belief of my Government, that the case, from its great bulk and entanglement, would be altogether beyond the compass of the personal attention of any arbitrator. Towards deciding upon this extensive boundary in unsettled regions, and on all the points of difference involved in it, it would become, I said, a part of his duty to examine

thirty folio volumes of manuscripts at the least, made up of conflicting statements, conflicting arguments, conflicting opinions. He would have besides to hunt for the lines of his award, if ever he should arrive at one, by the light of three collections of conflicting maps! Would it be proper, I asked, to approach any sovereign with an enumeration of these details of duty, for his own immediate personal occupation, or could his compliance, on such terms, be in candor expected? Hence, the suggestion of my Government was, that the investigation, if gone into at all by an umpire, must be by delegated authority; by a person or persons commissioned by the umpire to report to him a decision founded upon a full examination of the whole case, to which decision it would be enough that the umpire annexed his formal sanction. I added that, as the simplest way of carrying this suggestion into effect, it had occurred to my Government that the minister plenipotentiary of the sovereign arbitrator residing at Washington, should be charged with this delegated trust in such manner as would render its execution effectual. The British plenipotentiaries made immediate objections to this course. They said, that, if a settlement by umpirage was finally forced upon the parties, their opinion was, that it should take place at the court of the sovereign arbitrator, leaving him to seek there all such instrumentality and assistance in the case, as might be proper towards its investigation and decision. From the tone in which they urged this opinion, I am left under the belief that it is one from which their government would not depart.

It will be perceived, from my foregoing report, that this Government has manifested a reluctance, which I was incapable of overcoming, at entering into any distinctive agreement at present, upon any one of the preliminary points which you had given me in charge relative to this question.

The ground of their reluctance is obviously to be sought in their disappointment at my not consenting to connect it with the question of the St. Lawrence. As they not only declined coming into all agreement for settling the former question by compromise, but also coming into any of the previous arrangements indispensable for ripening it into a state for arbitration, what, I inquired, was to be done? Was the case to stand still? Was it never to be settled? I knew of no mode by which it could be brought to a close, except the two preceding. The British Plenipotentiaries replied, that they must not be understood as finally declining a resort to either mode of settlement; but they did not withhold an expression of their strong desire that the case should rest where it is, until my Government had become apprized of the discussions relative to the St. Lawrence, the nature of which, from their being until now new between the two nations, could not as yet be known. They wanted my Government, at least, to be made acquainted, before proceeding any farther, with their desire to treat of the two subjects in conjunction, and upon the terms which they had explained. I would not, of myself, have consented to this course, not feeling at all at liberty; but was not able to prevent it. I reconcile myself to it under the reflection, that possibly something may be thought due, all the circumstances considered, to this desire of Great Britain; and under the hope, that the slight additional loss of time thus incurred, may bring with it no peculiar inconvenience over a question that has already been pending since the Revolution. Having put you in possession of all the discussions which passed on it, and shown you the predicament in which it now stands, unsatisfactory I must own, I go on to the consideration of another subject. The protocols relating to it are, the ninth, the seventeenth, the eighteenth, and the nineteenth.

III. Admission of Consuls of the United States into the British colonial ports. My report upon this subject will be shortened, by the communications which I have already had the honor to address to you at former periods, in relation to it. I allude more particularly to my dispatches, number 343, and 352, of November and December, 1823, and to my official note to Mr. Secretary Canning, of the 17th November, 1823. In that note, written after I had received your dispatch of the 26th of June, 1823, I found it necessary to execute, in a great degree, the instructions which your dispatch contained. This Government, during the negotiation, as well as when the correspondence above alluded to took place, always considered the subject of appointing consuls, to reside in their colonies, as connected with that of the commercial intercourse generally: and here I agreed that the connexion was a natural one. It was evident, that, but for the opening of the colonial ports to our trade, we should not have asked for the privilege of appointing consuls to reside at them: and if, by any circumstances, they were again to be closed, it was equally evident, that our claim to consular representation would be at an end.

The consular appointments made by the President for Jamaica, St. Christopher's, and Antigua, Demerara, and Barbadoes, had been sufficiently explained and justified to this government, in the course of my communications above mentioned, in conjunction also with my number 349, which covered another official note from me to Mr. Canning, upon the same subject. Nevertheless, I did not omit to bring before the British Plenipotentiaries, all the circumstances of this correspondence. They were particularly pertinent to our discussions on the question of commercial intercourse, which had turned so entirely on the point of reciprocity, and throughout the whole course of which, it had been the

aim of each party to exonerate itself from any charge of deficiency in this important point, if not to fix that charge upon the other. I remarked upon the fact of our trade to the opened colonial ports having now continued for two years, without a single consul on the part of the United States, having, to this day, been recognized in any one of them, though at least three of those who had gone there and presented themselves for recognition, had been appointed under the previous and express consent of his Majesty's government; whilst, on the other hand, during the whole of this period, the British trade from those ports, had been receiving full consular protection from the consuls of Great Britain, in the ports of the United States. In this at least, it must be admitted, there was no reciprocity. Nor was the absence of it, cause of mere nominal complaint on the part of the United States. And here I brought into view, from your dispatch of the 26th of June, 1823, the practical inconveniences, especially in the Island of Barbadoes, to which our trade had been subjected, in the opened ports, on occasions which probably would not have occurred, had consuls from the United States been residing there. The British Plenipotentiaries met this complaint in the manner their Government had formerly done. They said, that when their consent had been given for appointing consuls at three of the colonial ports, it had been given under an expectation by Great Britain, that the United States would carry on the trade, on terms that were reciprocal; but that afterwards, finding the terms to be such as Great Britain did not consider reciprocal, she forbore to perfect the appointments, until the issue could be known, apprehending that the effect of new retaliatory measures on either side, would soon be, to put an end to the trade altogether. I rejoined, that, whatever motive deemed by herself sufficient, though not so regarded by the United States, Britain might allege for

her course of conduct in this particular, it did not destroy the broad fact, or lessen the evils arising from it, of Britain having enjoyed the advantage, during the two years of this trade, of full consular representation in the ports of the United States, whilst the United States had enjoyed none in the British ports.

On the principal question of the claim of the United States, to appoint consuls for the colonial ports, I took the ground which you had laid before me, and heretofore maintained in my note to Mr. Secretary Canning, of November the 17th, 1823, as well as in the one which I first of all addressed to him on this subject, on the 17th of October, 1822; namely, that our claim extended, not to any specified number of the colonial ports, but to all, without exception, that had been opened by the act of Parliament, of the 24th of June, 1822. This was the ground which I pressed upon the attention of the British Plenipotentiaries. It was the only ground, I said, which, in the true sense of reciprocity, and therefore, in the true sense of justice, could be supposed to be satisfactory to the United States. As they gave all, so it was reasonable that they should ask all. The United States excepted none of their ports to which the British colonial vessels resorted, from the residence of British consuls, and had a fair right to expect that none of the colonial ports to which American vessels resorted, would be excepted from the residence of American consuls. Consular protection was an incident of trade, which the United States did not feel at liberty to forego in behalf of their citizens, so long as they allowed it to be enjoyed in their ports, without limit or exception, by the subjects of Britain. It satisfied neither the real, nor even the verbal, meaning of the term reciprocity, in this discussion, to say, that the residence of British consuls in the ports of the United States, was matched by the residence of American consuls in the

ports of Great Britain, in Europe. It was palpable, that, if a British ship, whether arriving from Liverpool, or Barbadoes, received consular protection at New York, and an American ship received it at Liverpool, but not at Barbadoes, there was no reciprocity in fact, whatever artificial reasons might justify Britain to herself, in distinguishing, in this respect too, her colonial from her home dominion. The only true equivalent for the privilege on the one side, would be the extension of it to all the ports that were open, whether home or colonial, on the other.

The United States, I continued, in claiming to appoint consuls for all the colonial ports, meant not to make any unreasonable use of the privilege, and so I was instructed to declare. But the privilege of selecting the ports must rest, I said, exclusively with the United States. Their consular system did not recognize any fixed emoluments as the standard of remuneration for their consuls, but left it to depend upon the fees produced by trade. Hence, in the ports to which trade flowed, consuls were necessary, and to those where there was none, it was not to be supposed they would be sent, or even consent to go. But as the channels of trade were liable to shift, there was a manifest convenience and propriety, on this, as all other accounts, in leaving the selection of the ports to the sound discretion of the appointing power. Such were my remarks upon this subject, in addition to those I formerly made, orally and in writing, to Mr. Canning. I did not, in conclusion, offer any formal article in relation to it; first, because, I thought it unnecessary, after the aspect which the negotiation had assumed on the primary question of the commercial intercourse itself, and secondly, because I had been informed in your instructions, that the President was not tenacious of any article relating to consuls being inserted in a commercial convention, if one had been formed. But, I

gave the British Plenipotentiaries fully to understand the true nature of our claim, and, that it would not in anywise fall short of the privilege of appointing for all the opened ports.

They consented, substantially, to this principle, as will be seen by the protocol of the twenty-fourth conference. Their expression in it, that they saw no objection to the admission of our consuls into their colonies, "subject to the usual exceptions and reservations," means, that both parties were to be considered as reserving to themselves the privilege of excepting from the residence of consuls, such particular places as they might think proper. This, they explained to be their meaning. The same reservation had place in the sixteenth article of the treaty of the nineteenth of November, 1794; which was pointed out to me, by you, as the model of an article, on the present occasion, had one been framed. It also exists in the fourth article of the commercial convention, of the third of July, 1815; which article is indicated by the British Plenipotentiaries, as the model, in the fifth article of their own counter-projet annexed to the protocol of the sixteenth conference. The two articles on this subject, in the treaty of 1794, and in that of 1815, are so much alike that they might be adopted, indiscriminately, as models; the latter being a copy, with only slight variations, from the former. In my note to Mr. Canning, of the 17th of November, 1823, I had reminded him, that, in case Great Britain excluded American consuls from the ports of the colonies, the United States would have to reserve the right of excluding from consular benefit in their ports, all British vessels and seamen arriving from the colonies. So, also, I reminded the British Plenipotentiaries, that the United States would have to protect themselves, by a similar reservation, to an extent, co-equal with that to which Britain might use her option of excepting from the residence of our consuls,

particular places in her colonies, there being no other appropriate mode by which we could countervail on our side this right of exception on hers, so far as regarded her colonies.

It will be seen from the twenty-fourth protocol, that Britain continues to decline, for the present, receiving our consuls in any of her colonial ports. She acts, in this respect, under an impression that there is danger of the intercourse between these ports and the United States, being soon wholly interrupted. She waits the disappearance of this danger before she recognizes our consuls, as its reality would, according to her way of reasoning, render their recognition of little value. It was in vain that I urged the justice of recognizing ours at once, so that we might be upon a par with Great Britain, *until* ulterior events were known. If her tonnage duty of four shillings and threepence sterling per ton, on our vessels entering her colonial ports and her additional impost of ten per cent., be met by countervailing duties on our side, as I was forced, for the reasons given in another part of this dispatch, to intimate my belief would be the case, her Plenipotentiaries have informed me that it will lead to fresh measures, of the same character, on her side; thus bringing on a state of things, that can only terminate in rendering the trade no longer worth the pursuit of either country. If, on the other hand, the trade remains as at present regulated, without any alteration by either party, although Britain, as I have had occasion to remark before, alleges that she is dissatisfied with it, she will let it have a further trial, and in this event, will receive our consuls on the terms mentioned in the twenty-fourth protocol. This she will do, as I understand her intentions, notwithstanding the tenor of the fifth article of her counter-projet, above mentioned, which would seem to make her consent to the reception of our consuls dependent upon our acceptance of her four preceding articles. I

believe, moreover, that she would raise no obstacle on the score of expense, but grant to our consuls exequaturs free of all charge, as we grant exequaturs to hers. This point I mentioned to the British Plenipotentiaries, and to its obvious justice they took no exception. There remains nothing further for me to impart to you on this subject. The protocols that relate to it, are the twenty-third and the twenty-fourth.

IV. Newfoundland Fishery.—This subject was thrown out of the negotiation altogether. I was not the less mindful, however, of your instructions upon it, and the subject must be now explained, as it was otherwise taken up and handled. I brought it under the notice of the British Plenipotentiaries at the tenth conference. I gave them a full history of the question from its origin. I stated the grounds of complaint which the United States had against France, as shown by the bare statement of the relative rights and pretensions of the two nations to the fishery in dispute. I stated the past unwillingness of France to do us justice, and the obligations hence arising to Great Britain to interpose her friendly and efficacious offices to the end that justice should be rendered to us. From your dispatch of the 27th of June, 1823, I also stated the motives which had restrained the President, until the present epoch, from laying this case before the British Government, motives which I felt sure would be appreciated, and which would increase the claims it now had to attention. The case being wholly new until now, in any formal shape to this Government, and being one which involved also the duties and the rights of a third power, I thought that it would be most proper not to content myself with a verbal explanation of it merely. Having, therefore, gone through with this, under the lights which your instructions and my own past investigations of the subject had afforded, I finished, by delivering to the

British Plenipotentiaries, a paper, embracing a written summary of its merits, and one which might serve as a memorandum to Great Britain, of the true nature of our claim. This paper consists of a synopsis of the question which I had formerly made out from Mr. Gallatin's letter to me of August the third, 1822, together with a reference to a correspondence subsequently carried on by the United States and France in relation to it. It is amongst the papers of the negotiation, marked E, and annexed to the protocol of the tenth conference. It commences with references to the different treaties; that of Utrecht, in 1713; of Aix la Chapelle, in 1748; of Paris, in 1763; our own with Britain, in 1783; that between Britain and France of the same year, and the treaty of Paris of 1814, also between Britain and France; all of which go to show that, whilst France possessed the right of taking fish on the western coast of the island of Newfoundland, she did not possess it, as she now claims it, *exclusively;* but that Great Britain, the undoubted sovereign of the island, held it in common with her: it next recites the first article of the convention of the 20th of October, 1818, between the United States and Great Britain, by which the people of the United States are expressly allowed to take fish on the western coast (and on other parts) of this island, in common with the subjects of Great Britain: it then states the fact of the cruisers of France having, in the years 1820 and 1821, ordered American fishing vessels away from this coast, even whilst they were within the acknowledged jurisdiction of the island, threatening them with confiscation if they refused: finally, it concludes with pointing to the threefold duty which devolved upon Great Britain under the emergency described; 1st, To make good the title of the United States to take fish on the coast in question, as stipulated by the convention of 1818; but, 2d, If she could not do that, to give the United States an equiva-

lent for the loss of so valuable a right; and 3d, To vindicate her own sovereignty over this island, already impaired and further threatened by the conduct of the French cruisers towards the fishing vessels of the United States within its jurisdiction. The paper subjoined copies of all the official notes that passed between Mr. Gallatin and Viscount Chateaubriand, in January, February, and April, 1823, on the respective rights of the two nations to the fishery in controversy.

The British Plenipotentiaries, after having this paper in their possession, and consulting, as they informed me, their Government respecting it, entered upon the matter of it at the next succeeding conference. They said that it was not their intention to controvert the title of the United States to participate with Great Britain in certain fishing liberties described in the first article of the convention of 1818. They said, too, that the United States might require a declaration of the extent of those liberties as enjoyed by British subjects, under any limitations prescribed by treaty with other powers. The United States might also ask from Britain, as sovereign of the island of Newfoundland, support in the enjoyment of the liberties, as so limited. But, the Plenipotentiaries went on to remark, that the nature of the question seemed, in their opinion, to be varied, by France having, as seen in the notes of Viscount Chateaubriand to Mr. Gallatin, placed her claim to exclude the United States from the fishery in dispute, on engagements contracted by the United States with France prior to the convention of 1818, and also on the fact of the United States having opened discussions upon the whole subject with France. They further remarked, that they had understood, from one of their own negotiators of the convention of 1818, that the American negotiators had been apprized, at that period, by Great Britain, of the French right to fish on this

coast. At all events, they said that, as the subject stood, they must decline entertaining it as one susceptible of being handled in any effective way, at present, in this negotiation. Whatever rights or remedies the United States were entitled to from Great Britain upon the occasion, could be brought into view, if thought necessary, by a direct application to the British Government, in the usual form. With this intimation they would consider the subject, for so they concluded with saying, as no longer upon the list of those which it was the object of our endeavors to mould into a general treaty or convention between the two states.

I said to the British Plenipotentiaries, in reply, that I had certainly not anticipated all the above avowals. I did not admit that the fact of the United States having opened a correspondence upon this subject with France, could diminish, in any degree, their right to resort to Great Britain, remarking that it could scarcely have been expected that a forbearance on their part to appeal to this resort in the first instance, from considerations of delicacy, both towards Britain and France, was now to be turned against them. Forbearance had been due to France, at first, to avoid the appearance of recurring, on a question between her and the United States, to the aid of a third power; and to Great Britain it had been due, as it was hoped that the case might have been settled without putting her upon her decided duty of interfering. As little did I admit the allegation of the French Government, that the United States were excluded from this fishery by their previous engagements to France, was entitled to any weight. These engagements, I said, had been made under treaties long since expired, and the provisions of which were otherwise nugatory as to any just bearing upon this controversy. Here I adverted to the arguments used by Mr. Gallatin in reply to the notes of the Viscount Chateaubriand, relative to the operation of the

tenth article of the treaty with France of 1778, and of the twenty-seventh article of the convention with her of 1800, arguments which completed the demonstration, as you had remarked in your dispatch, that the pretension of France to an exclusive fishery was not to be supported. I admitted, as one of the American negotiators of the convention of 1818, that we had heard of the French right at that time, but never that it was *exclusive*. Such an inference was contradicted, not only by the plain meaning of the article in the convention of 1818, but by the whole course and spirit of the negotiation, which, it was well known, had been drawn out into anxious and protracted discussions upon the fishery question. As regarded the arguments of Viscount Chateaubriand, I reminded the British Plenipotentiaries, that, whilst part of them labored to give to obsolete treaties, as against the United States, a validity and extent greater than they ever could have had whilst *existing*, the remainder went to assert a pre-existing and exclusive right in France to fish on this coast, as against all the world, and, of course, as against Great Britain. Was Britain, I asked, prepared to acquiesce in this branch of the argument? for, undoubtedly, it was that which it most concerned France to establish, and without which the other branch would be of little avail to her.

The British Plenipotentiaries peremptorily asserted a right in Great Britain to participate in the fishery on this coast, and denied in the same tone that the French right was exclusive. But having concluded to consider the subject as no longer amongst those embraced in our negotiations, they declined pursuing any further the discussion of it, leaving me to pursue such other course as I might judge applicable and expedient. My great duty having been to place the subject explicitly before this Government, with a view as well to our rights as our remedies, I said to the

British Plenipotentiaries that the form in which I did so was not material, and that I should therefore adopt, without delay, that of addressing an official representation, in regard to the whole subject, to His Majesty's principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. I accordingly prepared such a note to Mr. Canning, a copy of which will be found amongst the papers which I transmit, under date of the 3d of May. I do not recapitulate its contents, as they are to the same general effect with the paper which I had previously caused to be annexed to the protocol of the tenth conference. I was careful, in the pursuance of your directions, to give it an aspect as friendly towards France as was compatible with duly making known the rights of the United States. I recollect nothing further that I have to communicate in explanation of this subject. The protocols in which it is mentioned, are the tenth and the fourteenth. My note to Mr. Canning, considered in the light of a first formal application to this Government, is designed to bring on explanations respecting our claim between the Governments of Britain and France. These, I must hope, will take place, and eventuate in a manner satisfactory to the United States. I mentioned to the British Plenipotentiaries the strong intimation given to Mr. Gallatin by the French Minister of Marine, that, as France had, according to her own judgment, the exclusive rights of fishery on the coast in dispute, so she ought to expel from it the fishing vessels of *any* nation. But I abstained from inserting this intimation in my note to Mr. Canning. I did no more than advert to the menace of seizure directed by France against our vessels.

V. Maritime Questions.—I entered upon this subject with all the anxiousness that belongs to its deep and permanent connexion with the interests and character of the United States; with all the recollections called up by their

past history, and all the anticipations which every view of the future must awaken. It was at the thirteenth conference that I brought it forward. I laid before the British Plenipotentiaries the opinions and the hopes which my Government had formed upon this great branch of the relations between the two countries, and strove to do justice to the principles upon which they were founded. I said that the United States were not behind any of the powers of Europe in wishes, and, moving in their proper sphere, would never be behind them in endeavors, to bring about a general melioration in the condition of mankind. That such a principle was eminently congenial to their political institutions, and had always been a maxim of their policy in the whole system of their external relations. Peace, I said, was their invariable desire, as well as policy; but war taking place, it had been as invariably their desire and their effort to do homage to those beneficent principles which serve as well to shorten its duration as mitigate its evils. I instanced as pertinent to this negotiation with Great Britain, the stipulations of the tenth and the twenty-sixth articles of the treaty of the nineteenth of November, 1794, when both countries successfully engaged in the work of sacrificing to these principles belligerent rights which both in strictness might otherwise have claimed and exercised.

But, in the wide maritime field, whether occupied by the belligerent or the neutral, there were, I continued, questions of the highest moment to the United States and Great Britain, which they had heretofore ineffectually endeavored to arrange. These questions the United States again desired to approach, animated by the hope that better auspices might shed themselves over another attempt to come to a satisfactory and harmonious understanding respecting them. My Government, I remarked, was not discouraged from this attempt by the failure to adjust them during the nego-

tiations at Ghent; nor by the more recent failure at London, in 1818. Even since the latest of these periods, the most material changes have been witnessed in the political aspect of Europe and of America. The European alliance had been impaired by a variance in the principles, or in the policy, of some of its chief members, and the whole of that part of the continent of America, lately dependent upon Europe, had assumed a new character in itself, and was hastening to new relations with the rest of the world. The most extensive alterations, if not an entire revolution, in the colonial system, would, in all probability, follow in the train of the latter of these changes. These would probably superinduce the necessity of corresponding changes in maritime interests and claims, once regarded by Great Britain as essential to her welfare. I remarked, too, that the circumstance of Britain having held towards this struggle in America an attitude of neutrality, as she had also done towards the recent war in the Spanish peninsula, had served to strengthen the belief that she might, perhaps, at the present period, be disposed to view neutral doctrines in different and more favorable lights than formerly, under circumstances so opposite.* It was under the combined force of these considerations, that the United States again came forward to her, with an offer to negotiate on them. But if Britain still viewed them as hitherto, if she still felt herself restrained from treating of them except on her former maritime principles, my Government would prefer being so informed with candor in the outset, it being alike due to candor to say; that the principles of the United States remained the same, there having been no equipollent changes in their political, commercial, or maritime position in the world. It was thus that I opened this part of the subject to the British Plenipotentiaries, discouraging our entering upon

* See on this subject, pages 465 and 466, ante.

any discussion of these questions, upon terms not promising to be productive of beneficial results.

I then proceeded to the paramount part of your instructions of the 28th of July, 1823. I said that there was yet another object, new to all the past discussions between the two Governments, but of pre-eminent interest in the eyes of mine, by its connection with the cause of civilization and the peace of the world, which it desired to propose to Great Britain. This great object was, THAT OF TOTALLY ABOLISHING ALL PRIVATE WAR UPON THE OCEAN.

The United States, I said, from an early period of their history, aimed at bringing about, among Nations, this great consummation of benevolence and humanity. Once, they had secured it, by a treaty with one of the powers of Europe, namely, with Prussia; and now they desired to offer it to the consideration of Great Britain. They hoped that she would go hand in hand with them in giving validity and extent to the benign consequences which its general adoption must introduce into the world. The question, though of novelty between the two Governments, was one of too much magnitude under considerations of a moral as well as political nature, to be discarded on that account. In proceeding to develope the reasoning by which you had directed me to recommend this object to the favor and acceptance of the British Government, it may be sufficient for me to say, that I omitted no part of it, resorting, under this delicate head of my instructions, to the very language of them, as the most appropriate and effectual for imparting the sentiments which they embodied, and superadding such views of my own as justly flowed from yours. I need not, therefore, repeat, any more at large, the manner in which I executed this portion of my duty. I aimed at doing it fully, and finished by expressing, in the name of my Government, a hope that Great Britain might be able

to see her way towards a concurrence in this great object; the more so, as it was also to be proposed by the United States to other European nations, with whom the example of Great Britain might be of powerful, perhaps decisive influence.

The British Plenipotentiaries promised to take my whole exposition of the subject into consideration, and consult their Government before giving me an answer as to the course which it might become their duty to adopt.

In speaking of the maritime questions heretofore in discussion between the two countries, I had mentioned that of impressment as of leading importance. A question was then put to me by the British Plenipotentiaries, which, with my answer, it is proper that I should at once state. They asked whether I would be willing to treat of the above class of questons generally, supposing impressment not to be included among the number. I had anticipated such a question, and was prepared with an answer. Your instructions not having supplied me with one, it was only left for me to act upon my own discretion. I therefore declined such a course, saying, that I was unwilling to enter at all upon the other points of maritime law, unless the question of impressment were received by Great Britain as part of the negotiation. It will be understood, that I spoke independently of the question of abolishing private war upon the ocean.

My reasons for this determination were derived, first from the extraordinary importance of the question of impressment, transcending, as, in my judgment it did, not only the importance of any other, but the collective importance of them all. I knew of no other so closely linked in with the rights, the sovereignty, and the peace of the Republic. There was always a rational hope, that the harmony of the two countries might remain undisturbed in the absence of conventional arrangements upon the other questions; but that

of impressment always carried with it the seed of dissension, was always difficult, always threatening. The question of blockade, of contraband, of the right of the neutral carrier to protect the property of an enemy, and all the maritime questions, were of a nature to be sure, which it would be desirable to settle; but, upon some of them the two Governments had not always been widely asunder in their negotiations, and the whole were distinguished by this feature, that each party, when differences arose under them, could more readily appeal to the standard of principles and usages to which other nations appealed. Impressment, on the contrary, springing from a claim by Great Britain to enforce her common law upon the high seas, was not so much distinguished by its international, as by its exclusive character. It was a question in a great measure sui generis; peculiar, in its practical operation, to the two nations; remarkable for the earnestness and perseverance with which the point of right was asserted to exist on the one side, and the explicitness with which it had ever been pronounced a positive and insupportable wrong upon the other. I did not therefore believe, that any treaty on maritime questions, admitting that one had been concluded, would have been acceptable to my Government, of which an adjustment of this subject of perpetual animosity and collision did not make a part. Another reason was, that I followed, in this respect, the precedent, or at least the analogy, of the negotiation of 1818. It will be recollected, that, in that negotiation, the Plenipotentiaries of the United States were instructed not to entertain the discussion of maritime topics, unless that of impressment were also brought forward, and by Great Britain. I trust that these reasons for the course which I pursued, may be approved. It is alike proper for me to mention, that, whilst I declined going into the field of maritime discussion, impressment being left out of it, I

avowed my perfect readiness to take up impressment by itself. Its absorbing interest justified, also, in my eyes, this course.

The British Plenipotentiaries, on hearing this last opinion from me, immediately inquired if I had any new securities to propose on behalf of my Government, against the employment of British subjects in the merchant vessels of the United States. I replied that I had none that differed essentially from those brought forward in former negotiations.

After an interval of deliberation, which was not over until the twenty-first conference, the British Plenipotentiaries communicated to me the decision of their Government upon the topics which I had unfolded to them. First, they spoke of impressment. They said, that Great Britain anxiously desired to reconcile the exercise of this established right with the convenience and feelings of other nations; that this desire had ever actuated her heretofore, and ever would in future. It was her duty to obey its impulse, and her interest no less than her duty. But, the right was nevertheless one essential to her highest interests, and deemed by her, as incontrovertible as it was ancient. It was a right interwoven with the frame of her laws, and precious to her by its connection with principles to which she trusted for her strength and her safety at conjunctures when both might be at stake. She could never abandon such a right; it was impossible. Nor would her duty allow her to waive it, with respect to the United States, but upon conditions the most satisfactory. She could only forego it in their favor, on receiving what she could deem ample security that the objects for which it was exercised, might be attained by other means. They added, that, having been informed by me, that I had no proposals to make on this head, essentially differing from those which my Government had submit-

ted in former negotiations, they felt themselves forced to abstain in this, from entering into the subject. The sentiments of their Government, with respect to the impressment of British subjects, in time of war, out of the merchant vessels of whatever nation, upon the high seas, remained unchanged, and they could therefore indulge no hope of any good results from a fresh discussion on the same grounds which Great Britain had, on full deliberation, adjudged to be inadequate in all former discussions. It was to this effect that the British Plenipotentiaries spoke. It was in this manner that they disposed of the question of impressment.

With regard to the other maritime questions, affecting the relations of neutral and belligerent powers, the Plenipotentiaries remarked, that, as I was not prepared to enter into stipulations respecting them, but in conjunction with the question of impressment, which was excluded for the reason given, the discussion of the others in any way, could be to no useful purpose. It would therefore be declined by them.

Thus it was, that the whole of this subject fell to the ground. The decision upon it will be found recorded in the protocol of the twenty-first conference.

I next said to the British Plenipotentiaries, that the question of abolishing privateering, and the capture of private property at sea, whether by national ships, or by privateers, was one that I considered as standing apart from those on which their decision had been given to me. Upon this question, therefore, I desired them to understand, that I was ready to treat, as a question occupying ground wholly of its own.

They replied, that they were not prepared to adopt this course. All other questions of a maritime nature having been shut out from the negotiation, there would be, they said, manifest inconvenience in going into that for abolish-

ing private war upon the ocean. They considered it a question belonging to the same class with maritime questions, and one which, besides being totally new, as between the two Governments, contemplated a most extensive change in the principles and practice of maritime war, as hitherto sanctioned by all nations. Such was their answer.

This answer was given in the terms I here state, and so entered upon the protocol. But, it is proper for me to remark, that no sentiment dropped from the British Plenipotentiaries authorizing the belief, that they would have concurred in the object, if we had proceeded to the consideration of it. My own opinion is, that Great Britain is not prepared at present to accede, under any circumstances, to the proposition for abolishing private war upon the ocean.

By the preceding decisions of the British Government, in conjunction with the restrictions under which I had laid myself, discussions the most interesting, and which it might have been anticipated would have been the most ample, have been precluded. My report, by necessary consequence, under this division of your instructions, becomes proportionably abridged. From your dispatch of the 28th of July, 1823, I understood that I was to make no communication to the British Government of the draft of the articles which it enclosed, unless they first agreed to negotiate respecting them. As they declined doing so upon the terms, which, taking into view the whole spirit of your instructions, I had alone deemed admissible, it follows, that I withheld, altogether, any offer of the draft. The negotiation on the maritime questions fell through ostensibly, and, according to my best judgment, with sufficient reason, on the point of impressment. But, here, too, I have to remark, that the British Plenipotentiaries said nothing to warrant the opinion of any change in the doctrines of their Govern-

ment on the other points of maritime law, any more than upon that of impressment. My own opinion is, that no such change has yet taken place. If the altered political and commercial circumstances of the times should hereafter serve to make her rule of 1756 an exception, it will probably be found the only exception. Nor will this be a rule abandoned by her, so much as lapsed; nor even wholly lapsed, if, according to indications contained in earlier parts of this communication, there be any likelihood of her return to her own colonial system in the West Indies, rather than of her making larger departures from it. I am aware, that she would probably denominate it a coerced return; whilst all the facts would present to the United States a view of the subject so very different.

The British Plenipotentiaries, after all negotiation on the maritime questions had been foreclosed, informed me that they were willing to treat of other points, which, though not immediately falling under this class, were connected with the friendly intercourse between the two countries, and would aim at its improvement. I replied, that I was not prepared to enter into any stipulations with them of this description, detached from all other subjects, but that I would receive and transmit to my Government, whatever proposals they might have to offer of the nature stated. They accordingly gave me, at the twenty second conference, the substance of nine articles, which are enclosed, [marked M] as belonging to the protocol of that conference. They were not put into a formal shape, being rather the heads of subjects, than as designed to be expressed in full language.

The first of these articles relates to the mutual delivery of criminals, the subjects or citizens of either party, taking refuge in the dominions of the other, analogous to the twenty-seventh article of the treaty of November, 1794, so far as

murder and forgery were concerned. The second proposes arrangements for settling the claims made by the subjects or citizens of either party, to lands situate within the territories of the other in America, and arising out of grants heretofore made by authorities competent, at the time, to make them. The following is the explanation of this article: At the opening of the negotiation, the British Plenipotentiaries inquired whether I was empowered to treat of certain claims of British subjects to lands in Florida. I replied, that my instructions embraced no allusion whatever to such a subject, and that, if brought forward by Great Britain, all that I could do, would be to refer it to my Government. It was the first mention of it that I had heard, and it was not mentioned afterwards. It is to this subject that the above article points. The third article has reference to the non-confiscation of private debts in case of war between the two countries; as the fifth has to the protection of the merchants on each side, found within the dominions of the other, on the breaking out of war, as under the tenth and twenty-sixth articles of the treaty of 1794. Though fully aware of the importance attached to the principle of these articles, under your instructions, I did not feel myself at liberty to conclude engagements concerning them in a detached way. After the question of impressment had been expunged, and all the other maritime questions, together with that for the abolition of private war upon the ocean, which I could not but regard as the chief questions contemplated under your dispatch of the 28th of July, 1823, it did not seem to me, either necessary or judicious, that a treaty should be entered into for the sake of these two articles alone. I was the more swayed to this opinion, from the hope which may reasonably be cherished, that neither nation will henceforth be disposed to depart in practice from the principles which these articles sanctify, though not now confirmed by a new treaty,

since both nations have formerly agreed to them in this manner, and are both seen at this day substantially ready to propose them again to each other's acceptance.

The remainder of their articles, as a brief recapitulation of them will show, are only of subordinate interest. The fourth provides for a previous statement of grievances, and demand of redress, before a resort to reprisals by either party, like the twenty-second article of the treaty of '94. The sixth relates to wrecks and salvage, as is common in treaties between commercial nations. The seventh extends hospitality to vessels of either party, forced by stress of weather into ports of the other, to which they would not, under other circumstances, be admissible; as is also common, and as has place in the treaty of '94. The eighth contains a provision respecting merchant vessels rescued from pirates; and the ninth, and last, a provision for mutually exempting the consuls of each nation, within the territories of the other, from personal service, and the operation of direct taxes. It must be confessed, that, under this last provision, it would be the consuls of the United States who would derive the most benefit.

On my declining, for the reasons I have given, to conclude any arrangement at present on the foregoing articles, the British Plenipotentiaries lamented, that, whilst *they* made the inability to treat of impressment no obstacle to entering into stipulations concerning them, I did. To this I replied, by remarking upon the obviously different ground on which the two nations stood in this particular. To the United States, the question of impressment was absolutely vital. To Great Britain, it was of little concern, further than as it might be supposed that she was desirous of rendering to the United States justice in regard to it. The British Plenipotentiaries here repeated the unfeigned regret which they said they felt, at our preliminary terms having precluded

them from arranging, at so favorable a season of peace, this question, which they desired I would understand that they too considered as one of great moment. Whilst they held their right to resort to the practice of impressment to be fully sanctioned by the general voice of nations, under that maxim which entitled every nation to command the allegiance and services of its own subjects, they were not unaware that the practice itself, from peculiar and insurmountable causes, pressed heavily upon the people of the United States. Hence, they had been most anxious to come to some arrangement, by which an end might have been put to this source of contention; and they declared, that they would have accounted it amongst the happiest and proudest incidents of their lives, had they been able to sign with me a treaty, by which so imposing a bar to the harmony of our respective countries could have been effectually and permanently removed. As things had eventuated, all that they could say was, and this they desired to say in a spirit the most sincere and earnest, that, whenever, in future, the practice might be resorted to, it would be in a manner to give the least possible inconvenience to the United States, and none that could ever be avoided, consistently with what was imperiously due to the essential rights and interests of Great Britain.

I joined in the regrets expressed by the British Plenipotentiaries, and, I will presume to add, in a spirit not less sincere. I lamented our failure to come to an understanding upon this formidable question; one upon which, perhaps, the peace of two powerful nations hung. I spoke of the past offers of the United States for its settlement; how far they had gone; how far they would still go, in an accommodation to the British views. They had offered to abstain from employing British seamen on board their vessels, for they did not want them there, having seamen

enough of their own; and to effect this exclusion, they offered the highest enactments and sanctions of their laws; pledges which they deemed sufficient, and which they could never help thinking might be accepted as sufficient. It was to be considered, I said, that impressment was a question in which were bound up the highest rights and interests of the United States, no less than of Great Britain. The United States admitted not the doctrine of perpetual allegiance. As the rule of nations, ancient or modern, they denied its existence. It had no place in their own code, and if it had in that of Britain, it was but as a municipal rule and ought to be only executed at home, not upon the high seas on board the vessels of an independent and sovereign state. The latter carried with it the assumption of a right of search *for men*. This, whether as a right direct or incidental, was denied by the United States to have the least sanction in public law. The bare claim was affronting to the United States, in the dearest attributes of their national sovereignty. I declared, that I too would have hailed it as the most auspicious act of my life, to have been able to mark the last days of my official residence at his Majesty's court, by putting my name with theirs to stipulations, that would have closed up for ever this fruitful and bitter source of strife between our countries. As it was, it was only left for me to deplore results, under which so high and solid a satisfaction had vanished from me. By an interchange of remarks such as these, neither side had proposed to itself any discussion or review of a question already dropped from our discussions, but barely to give expression to sentiments which both sides have such good cause for feeling, at the abortive issue of this new endeavor to get rid of the evils of impressment.

Before leaving this part of the subject entirely, I feel impelled to one or two extraneous observations. The practice

of seizing men by force for the supply of the navy, even as a lawful exercise of municipal authority in Britain, is one that carries with it such a disregard of the liberty of the subject, and involves such an aggravation of individual horrors, that the propriety, the humanity, and the very policy, of its total relinquishment, even in her own dominions, has not escaped the thoughts of some of her enlightened men, as due to all such considerations as well as to the genius of her free institutions. On my first arrival in this country, I had occasion to notice, and not unfrequently, evidences of the existence of this feeling, both in private life and in the discussions of the press, and was willing to give way to the hope of its further, and, at no very distant day, efficient progress. I lament to say, that this cheering hope has for the present been put back by a recent indication, the relevancy of which, to the subject-matter of this part of my report, will be sufficient, I trust, to excuse my allusion to it. At the late session of Parliament, and only in the month of June, Mr. Hume, an active member of the House of Commons from Scotland, introduced into the House a motion expressly upon the subject of impressment. The purport of it was, that "the House, being well aware of the difficulty of manning the navy in time of war, and of the evils of forcibly impressing men for that purpose, and considering that a time of profound peace would best admit of the fullest and fairest examination of that most important subject, would, early in the next session of Parliament, take it into their serious consideration, with a view to the adoption of such regulations as might prevent those evils in future, consistently with the efficiency of the navy, and the best interest of the British empire." In giving his notice of this motion he declared, as one motive for its claims upon the attention of the House, that it would be a part of his duty in discussing it, to show, that in the event of a new war between Great Britain and any of the European powers,

it would be impossible for her to continue the practice of impressment, without adding the United States to the list of her enemies. It is a fact, to be deplored, that even such a motion as this, a motion that proposed nothing more than a future and guarded consideration of a subject so full of international importance, (the light alone in which it is of any concern to the United States,) should have been scarcely listened to by the British House of Commons! It was debated, to comparatively empty benches, and thrown out by a vote of one hundred and eight, to thirty-eight. The most impressive part of this public fact remains to be disclosed. This motion, which, in my mere capacity as an American spectator of the deliberations of the British Parliament, I cannot hesitate to think the most momentous by far in its bearing upon the foreign relations of the country of any that has offered itself to that body during my residence of nearly seven years in England—this motion, so far as I know, was not deemed worthy to engage the attention of a single minister of the crown. It is certain, that not one of them spoke upon it. In the House of Commons —in this alleged sanctuary of knowledge, patriotism, and statesmanship, in Britain—a question, implicating the highest interests of two whole nations, and most essentially their future peace, passed away with less of discussion and excitement than might have been given to a bill for laying off a new road, or enclosing a sterile heath. It was a spectacle calculated to fill with pain the mind of an American citizen, and I have adverted to it in no other spirit than that of unmingled sorrow at the greater distance to which, in conjunction with the failure of my negotiation, it seems, under present circumstances, to have removed all hope of arriving at a settlement of this ever perilous and exasperating topic of international hostility.

Having nothing more to say at present on the maritime

questions, I leave them. The protocols in which they are noticed are, the thirteenth, the twenty-first, and the twenty-second.

VI. North West Coast of America, [Oregon.]—I now come to the last of the subjects that the President confided to me; that contained in your instructions of the second of July, 1823, relative to the North West Coast of America. Although no arrangement was concluded on this subject, it is not the less incumbent upon me carefully to apprize you of the discussions by which it was marked. They will probably be found not without interest.

In one of my preliminary communications respecting the negotiation, viz: my number 356, I informed you, that I thought it necessary, yielding to events which transpired after your instructions were received, to treat of this subject of the North West Coast with this Government alone, without considering the negotiation as common also to Russia, as had been contemplated by your instructions. For thus deviating from your instructions, I assigned my reasons, which, as they weighed strongly with me at the time, and do not appear, from any lights that I possess, to have lost any of their force since, I must hope will have been approved. My duty, therefore, will now be confined to informing you of the discussions which took place in my hands with Britain, and as limited to the interests of the United States and Britain. These are the only discussions, I may add, with which I have any acquaintance, not having heard from Mr. Middleton of the nature of those carried on at St. Petersburg, though, through the kindness of the Russian Ambassador at this court, I have, very recently, been apprized of their result. It is probable that it has been through some accident that I have not heard from Mr. Middleton, having apprized him of the course that I had felt myself compelled to adopt. In obedience to your request,

I also wrote to him on the subject of the slave trade, transmitting him a copy of the convention with this Government, as soon as I had signed it.

In another of my communications, written before the negotiation opened, viz. my number 358, I gave you a general intimation of what I then supposed would be the terms upon which this Government would be disposed to arrange with us the questions of boundary upon the north-west coast. At that time, however, I had been put in possession of nothing distinctive or final upon the subject, and was to await the arrival of the negotiation itself for the full and authentic statement of the Britsh claims. I am the more particular in referring back to this latter communication, as it appears that I was under important misapprehensions in it, in regard to the true nature of the British claims. They proved, on formally and accurately disclosing themselves, to be far more extensive than I had believed, and were advanced in a manner more confident than I had even then anticipated.

I opened this subject to the British Plenipotentiaries at the eleventh conference. I remarked, that, although it had been understood in my preparatory conversations with the proper organ of His Majesty's Government, that the respective territorial or other claims of the United States and Russia, as well as of Great Britain and Russia, regarding the country westward of the Rocky Mountains, were to be matter of separate discussion at St. Petersburg: yet, that those of the United States and Great Britain were now, according to the understanding in subsequent conversations, to be taken up for formal discussion in London. My Government was aware, that the convention of October, 1818, between the United States and Great Britain, one article of which contained a temporary regulation of this interest, had still four years to run; but the President, nevertheless, was

of opinion, that the present was not an unsuitable moment for attempting a new and more definite adjustment of the respective claims of the two powers to the country in question. It was a country daily assuming an aspect, political, commercial, and territorial, of more and more interest to the United States. It bore upon their relations with other states, upon their fisheries as well as their commerce in the Pacific, upon their fur trade, and the whole system of their intercourse with vast tribes of the Indians. I reminded the British Plenipotentiaries, that, by the third article of the treaty of Washington, of February the twenty-second, 1819, between the United States and Spain, the boundary line between the two countries was fixed, in part, along the southern bank of the Arkansas, to its source, in latitude 42 north, and thence by that parallel of latitude, to the south sea; and that Spain had also renounced to the United States, by the same article, all her rights north of that parallel. I then made known, at this and other conferences, for, from the extent of the subject, I was unable even to open it all at one conference, what I understood to be the nature of the title of the United States to the whole of the country north of the parallel stated. I said, that, apart from all the right as thus acquired from Spain, which, however, was regarded by my Government as surpassing the right of all other European Powers, on that coast, the United States claimed, in their own right, and as their absolute and exclusive sovereignty and dominion, the whole of the country west of the Rocky Mountains, from the 42d to at least as far up as the 51st degree of north latitude. This claim they rested upon their first discovery of the river Columbia, followed up by an effective settlement at its mouth, a settlement which was reduced by the arms of Britain during the late war, but formally surrendered up to the United States at the return of peace. Their right by first discovery, they

deemed peculiarly strong, having been made not only from the sea by Captain Gray, but also from the interior by Lewis and Clarke, who first discovered its sources, and explored its whole inland course to the Pacific Ocean. It had been ascertained, that the Columbia extended, by the river Multnomah, to as low as 42 north; and by Clarke's river, to a point as high up as 51, if not beyond that point, and to this entire range of country, contiguous to the original dominion of the United States, and made a part of it by the almost intermingling waters of each, the United States, I said, considered their title as established by all the principles which had ever been applied on this subject by the powers of Europe, to settlements in the American hemisphere. I asserted, that a nation, discovering a country, by entering the mouth of its principal river at the sea coast, must necessarily be allowed to claim, and hold, as great an extent of the interior country, as was described by the course of such principal river, and its tributary streams, and that the claim, to this extent, became doubly strong, where, as in the present instance, the same river had also been discovered and explored from its very mountain springs to the sea. Such a union of titles, imparting validity to each other, did not often exist. I remarked, that it was scarcely to be presumed, that any European nation would henceforth project any colonial establishment on any part of the North West Coast of America, which, as yet, had never been used to any other useful purpose, than that of trading with the aboriginal inhabitants, or fishing in the neighboring seas; but that the United States should contemplate, and at one day form, permanent establishments there, was naturally to be expected, as proximate to their own possessions, and falling under their immediate jurisdiction. Speaking of the powers of Europe who had ever advanced claims to any part of this coast, I referred to the principles which had been

settled by the Nootka Sound Convention of 1790, and remarked that Spain had now lost all her exclusive colonial rights which were recognized under that convention, first, by the fact of the Independence of the South American states, and of Mexico, and next, by her express renunciation of all her rights, of whatever kind, above the 42d degree of north latitude, to the United States. Those new states, would, themselves, now possess the rights incident to their condition of political independence, and the claims of the United States above the 42d parallel, as high up as 60, claims as well in their own right, as by their succession to the title of Spain, would henceforth necessarily preclude other nations from forming colonial establishments upon any part of the American continents. I was therefore instructed to say, that my Government no longer considered any part of those continents as open to future colonization by any of the powers of Europe, and that this was a principle upon which I should insist in the course of the negotiation.

It was in this manner that I first laid down for the information of this Government, the principles contained in your dispatch, or resulting from them. I combined with what you had written to me, the contents of the message of tne President to Congress, of the 2d of December last, a document which I could not but regard as of the highest solemnity, towards marking out my duty, although I had not your instructions upon it, the message having appeared since your dispatch was written. I added, that the United States did not desire to interfere with the actual settlements of other Nations on the North West Coast of America, and that in regard to those which Great Britain might have formed above the 51st degree of latitude, they would remain, with all such rights of trade with the natives, and rights of fishery, as those settlements had enjoyed hitherto. As regarded future settlements by either of the parties, I

said that it was the wish of my Government to regulate these upon principles that might be mutually satisfactory, and tend to prevent all collision. I was therefore instructed to propose, first the extension to a further term of ten years, of the third article of the convention of October, 1818; and, secondly, that Britain should stipulate, during the like term, that no settlement should be made by any of her subjects, on the North West Coast of America, or the islands adjoining, either south of the fifty-first degree of latitude, or north of the fifty-fifth degree: the United States stipulating that none should be made by their citizens north of the fifty-first degree. This proposal I drew up in form, and annexed it (marked F) to the protocol of the twelfth conference. I said, that these limits were supposed to be sufficient to secure to Great Britain all the benefit to be derived from the settlements of her Northwest and Hudson's bay Companies on that coast and were indicated with that view.

The insertion of a limit of ten years which I introduced as applicable to the above restriction upon future settlements, may require explanation. In your dispatch to me, as I understood it, there was no such limit of time specified. But, in your instructions to Mr. Middleton, of the 22d of July, 1823, which you enclosed to me, I perceived that there was this limit introduced, and that it was under this limit the proposal was described to him as the one which I was to submit to the British Government. I concluded that it would be erring on the safe side, to take, in this particular, your instructions to Mr. Middleton, as my guide, and I did so accordingly.

It is proper now as on the question of the St. Lawrence, that I should give you faithful information of the manner in which the British Plenipotentiaries received my proposal, and the principles under which I had introduced it. I may set out by saying in a word, that they totally declined the

one, and totally denied the other. They said that Great Britain considered the whole of the unoccupied parts of America, as being open to her future settlements in like manner as heretofore. They included within these parts as well that portion of the North West Coast lying between the 42d and the 51st degrees of latitude, as any other parts. The principle of colonization on that coast, or elsewhere, on any portion of those continents not yet occupied, Great Britain was not prepared to relinquish. Neither was she prepared to accede to the *exclusive* claim of the United States. She had not, by her convention with Spain in 1790, or at any other period, conceded to that power any exclusive rights on that coast, where *actual settlements* had not been formed. She considered the same principles applicable to it now as then. She could not concede to the United States, who held the Spanish title, claims which she had felt herself obliged to resist, when advanced by Spain, and on her resistance to which, the credit of Great Britain had been thought to depend.

Nor could Great Britain at all admit, the Plenipotentiaries said, the claim of the United States, as founded on their own first discovery. It had been objectionable with her in the negotiation of 1818, and had not been admitted since. Her surrender to the United States of the post at Columbia River after the late war, was in fulfilment of the provisions of the first article of the Treaty of Ghent, without affecting questions of right on either side. Britain did not admit the validity of the discovery by Captain Gray. He had only been on an enterprise of his own, as an individual, and the British Government was yet to be informed under what principles or usage, among the nations of Europe, his having first entered or discovered the mouth of the river Columbia, admitting this to have been the fact, was to carry after it such a portion of the interior country as was alleged. Great Bri-

tain entered her dissent to such a claim, and, least of all, did she admit that the circumstance of a merchant vessel of the United States, having penetrated the coast of that continent at Columbia river, was to be taken to extend a claim in favor of the United States along the same coast, both above and below that river, over latitudes that had been previously discovered and explored by Great Britain herself, in expeditions fitted out under the authority and with the resources of the nation. This had been done by Captain Cook, to speak of no others, whose voyage was at least prior to that of Captain Gray. On the coast, only a few degrees south of the Columbia, Britain had made purchases of territory from the natives, before the United States were an independent power, and upon that river itself, or upon rivers which flowed into it west of the Rocky Mountains, her subjects had formed settlements coeval with, if not prior to, the settlement by American citizens at its mouth.

Such is a summary of the grounds taken at the very outset by the British Plenipotentiaries, in opposition to our claims. On my remarking immediately, and before proceeding to any discussion of them, that I had not before been aware of the extent and character of all these objections, they replied, that it was also for the first time that they had been apprized, in any authentic and full way, of the nature of the claims, as I had now stated them, on behalf of the United States; claims which they said they were bound to declare, at once, Great Britain was wholly unprepared to admit; and, especially, that which aimed at interdicting her from the right of future colonization in America.

Resuming the subject, I said, that it was unknown to my Government, that Great Britain had ever even advanced any claim to territory on the North West Coast of America, by right of occupation, before the Nootka Sound con-

troversy. It was clear, that, by the treaty of Paris, of 1763, her territorial rights in America were bounded westward by the Mississippi. The claim of the United States, under the discovery by Captain Gray, was, therefore, at all events, sufficient to overreach, in point of time, any that Great Britain could allege along that coast, on the ground of prior occupation and settlement. As to any alleged settlements by her subjects on the Columbia, or on rivers falling into it, earlier, or as early, as the one formed by American citizens at Astoria, I knew not of them, and was not prepared to admit the fact. As to the discovery itself of Captain Gray, it was not for a moment to be drawn into question. It was a fact before the whole world. The very geographers of Britain had adopted the name which he had given to this river. Vancouver himself, undoubtedly the first British navigator who had ever entered it, admitted that he found Captain Gray there; and the very instructions to this British officer, drawn up in March, 1791, and to be seen among the records of the British admiralty, expressly referred by name, to the previous expedition in that quarter of the American sloop, the Washington. Was this, I asked, to be accounted nothing? Did it lie with a foreign power, whose own archives might supply her with the incontestible fact of the first discovery by the vessel of another power, of a vast river whose waters, from their source to the ocean, had remained until then totally unknown to all civilized nations; did it lie with such foreign power to say, that the discovery was not made by a national ship, or under national authority? The United States, I said, could admit no such distinction: could never surrender, under the allegation of its existence, or upon any ground, their claim to this discovery. The ship of Captain Gray, whether fitted out by the Government of the United States, or not, was a national ship. If she was not so, in a technical

sense of the word, she was in the full sense of it, applicable to such an occasion. She bore at her stern the flag of the nation, sailed forth under the protection of the nation, and was to be identified with the rights of the nation. The extent of interior country attaching to this discovery, was founded, I said, upon a principle at once reasonable and moderate ;—reasonable, because, as discovery was not to be limited to the local spot of a first landing place, there must be a rule both for enlarging and circumscribing its range; and none more proper than that of taking the water courses which nature had laid down, both as the fair limits of the country, and as indispensable to its use and value;—moderate, because the nations of Europe had often, under their rights of discovery, carried their claims much farther. Here I instanced, as sufficient for my purpose, and pertinent to it, the terms in which many of the royal charters and letters patent had been granted, by the crown in England, to individuals proceeding to the discovery or settlement of new countries on the American continent: amongst others, those from Elizabeth, in 1578, to Sir Humphrey Gilbert, and, in 1584, to Sir Walter Raleigh: those from James I. to Sir Thomas Gates, in 1606 and 1607, and the Georgia charter of 1732. All these, extracts from which I produced, comprehended a range of country fully justifying my remark. By the words of the last, a grant is passed to all territories along the sea coast, from the river Savannah to the most southern stream "of another great river, called the Alatamaha, and westward, *from the heads of the said rivers*, in a direct line to the South Seas." To show that Britain was not the only European nation who, in her territorial claims on this continent, had had an eye to the rule of assuming water courses to be the fittest boundaries, I also cited the charter of Louis XIV. to Crozat, by which "all the country *drained by the waters emptying directly or indirectly into*

the Mississippi," is declared to be comprehended under the name, and within the limits, of Louisiana.

If Britain had put forth no claims on the North West Coast, founded on prior occupation, before the Nootka Sound contest, still less could she ever have established any, I remarked, at any period, founded on prior discovery. Claims of the latter class belonged wholly to Spain, and now, consequently, to the United States. The superior title of Spain on this ground, as well as others, was, indeed, capable of demonstration. Russia had acknowledged it in 1790, as the state papers of the Nootka Sound controversy would show. The memorial of the Spanish court to the British Minister on that occasion expressly asserted, that, notwithstanding all the attempted encroachments upon the Spanish coasts of the Pacific Ocean, Spain had preserved her possessions there entire, possessions which she had constantly, and before all Europe, on that and other occasions, declared to extend to as high at least as the 60th degree of north latitude. The very first article of the Nootka Sound convention, attested, I said, the superiority of her title: for, whilst, by it, the nations of Europe generally were allowed to make settlements on that coast, it was only for purposes of trade with the natives; thereby excluding the right of any exclusive or colonial establishments, for other purposes. As to any claim on the part of Britain under the voyage of Captain Cook, I remarked that this was sufficiently superseded (passing by every thing else) by the journal of the Spanish expedition from San Blas, in 1775, kept by Don Antonio Maurelle, for an account of which, I referred the British Plenipotentiaries to the work of Daines Barrington, a British author. In that expedition, consisting of a frigate and schooner, fitted out by the Viceroy of Mexico, the North West Coast was visited in latitude 45, 47, 49, 53, 55, 56, 57, and 58, not one of which points there was good

reason for believing, had ever been explored, or as much as seen, up to that day, by any navigator of Great Britain. There was, too, I said, the voyage of Juan Peres, prior to 1775; that of Aguilar in 1601, who explored that coast in latitude 45; that of de Fuca in 1592, who explored it in latitude 48, giving the name, which they still bore, to the straits in that latitude, without going through a much longer list of other early Spanish navigators in that sea, whose discoveries were confessedly of a nature to put out of view those of all other nations. I finished by saying, that, in the opinion of my Government, the title of the United States to the whole of that coast, from latitude 42 to as far north as latitude 60, was, therefore, superior to that of Britain, or any other power: first, through the proper claim of the United States by discovery and settlement, and, secondly, as now standing in the place of Spain, and holding in their hands all her title.

Neither my remarks nor my authorities, of which I have endeavored to present an outline, made the impression upon the British Plenipotentiaries which I was desirous that they should have produced. They repeated their animated denials of the title of the United States, as alleged to have been acquired by themselves, enlarging and insisting upon their objections to it, as I have already stated them. Nor were they less decided in their renewed impeachments of the title of Spain. They said, that it was well known to them, what had formerly been the pretensions of Spain to absolute sovereignty and dominion in the South Seas, and over all the shores of America which they washed; but that these were pretensions which Britain had never admitted. On the contrary, she had constantly and strenuously resisted them. They referred to the note of the British minister to the court of Spain, of May 16th, 1790, in which Britain had not only asserted a full right to an uninterrupted commerce and navi-

gation in the Pacific, but also that of forming, with the consent of the natives, whatever establishments she thought proper on the northwest coast, in parts not already occupied by other nations. This had always been the doctrine of Great Britain, and from it, nothing that was due, in her estimation, to other powers, now called upon her in any degree to depart. As to the alleged prior discoveries of Spain all along that coast, Britain did not admit them, but with great qualification. She could never admit that the mere fact of Spanish navigators having first seen the coast at particular points, even where this was capable of being substantiated as the fact, without any subsequent or efficient acts of sovereignty or settlement following on the part of Spain, was sufficient to exclude all other nations from that portion of the globe. Besides, they said, even on the score of prior discovery on that coast, at least as far up as the 48th degree of north latitude, Britain herself had a claim over all other nations. Here they referred to Drake's expedition in 1578, who, as they said, explored that coast, on the part of England, from 37 to 48 north, making formal claim to these limits in the name of Elizabeth, and giving the name of New Albion to all the country which they comprehended. Was this, they asked, to be reputed nothing in the comparison of prior discoveries, and did it not even take in a large part of the very coast now claimed by the United States as of prior discovery on their side? Such was the character of their remarks on this part of the title. In connexion with them, they called my attention to the report of a select committee of the House of Representatives in April last, on the subject of Columbia river. There is a letter from General Jesup in this report, adopted by the committee as part of the report, and which, as the British Plenipotentiaries said, had acquired importance in the eyes of their Government, from that fact. They commented upon several passages of

of this letter, a newspaper copy of which they held in their hands, but chiefly on that part which contains an intimation, that a removal from our territory of all British subjects now allowed to trade on the waters of the Columbia, might become a necessary measure on the part of the United States, as soon as the convention of 1818 had expired. Of this intimation the British Plenipotentiaries complained, as one calculated to put Great Britain especially upon her guard, arriving, as the document did, at a moment when a friendly negotiation was pending between the two Powers, for the adjustment of their relative and conflicting claims to that entire district of country. Had I any knowledge, they asked, of this document?

I replied that I had not, as communicated to me by my Government. All that I could say of it was, and this I would say confidently, that I was sure it had been conceived in no unfriendly spirit towards Great Britain. Yet, I was bound, unequivocally, to re-assert, and so I requested the British Plenipotentiaries would consider me as doing, the full and exclusive sovereignty of the United States over the whole of the territory beyond the Rocky Mountains, washed by the river Columbia, in manner and extent as I had stated, subject of course, to whatever existing conventional arrangements they may have formed in regard to it, with other Powers. Their title to this whole country they considered as not to be shaken. It had often been proclaimed in the legislative discussions of the nation, and was otherwise public before the world. Its broad and stable foundations were laid in the first uncontradicted discovery of that river, both at its mouth and at its source, followed up by an effective settlement; and that settlement the earliest ever made, upon its banks. If a title in the United States, thus transcendent, needed confirmation, it might be sought in their now uniting to it the title of Spain. It was

not the intention of the United States, I remarked, to repose upon any of the extreme pretensions of that power to speculative dominion in those seas, which grew up in less enlightened ages, however countenanced by Papal authority in those ages; nor had I, as their Plenipotentiary, sought any aid from such extreme pretensions; but to the extent of the just claims of Spain, grounded upon her fair enterprise and resources, at periods when her renown for both filled all Europe, the United States had succeeded, and upon claims of this character, it had therefore become as well their right as their duty to insist. I asserted again the incontestible priority of Spanish discoveries on the coast in question. I referred to the voyage of Cortez, who, in 1537 discovered California; to those of Alarçon and Coronado in 1540; to that of Cabrillo in 1542, all of whom were prior to Drake, and the last of whom made the coast, by all the accounts that are given, as high up as latitude 44. As to Drake, I said, that, although Fleurieu, in his introduction to Marchand, did assert, that he got as far north as 48, yet Hakluyt, who wrote almost at the time that Drake flourished, informs us, that he got no higher than 43, having put back at that point from "the extreme cold." All the later authors or compilers, also, who spoke of his voyage, however they might differ as to the degree of latitude to which he went, adopted from Hakluyt this fact of his having turned back, from the intensity of the weather. The preponderance of probability, therefore, I alleged, as well as of authority, was, that Drake did not get beyond 43 along that coast. At all events, it was certain that he had made no settlements there; and the absence of these would, under the doctrine of Great Britain, as applied by her to Spain, prevent any title whatever attaching to his supposed discoveries. They were, moreover, put out of view by the treaty of 1763, by which Britain agreed to con-

sider the Mississippi as her western boundary upon that continent.

Our discussions, which grew into length, and only a condensed view of which I have aimed at presenting to you, terminated without any change of opinion on either side. Having stated the principal points which marked them, my duty seems to be drawing to a close, without the necessity of setting before you all the amplifications and details into which, on topics so copious, they would sometimes run. They were ended on the side of Great Britain, by her Plenipotentiaries repeating, that they found it altogether impossible to accede, either to the proposal of the United States, or to the reasoning invoked in its support. That, nevertheless, they desired to lay a foundation of harmony between the two countries in that part of the globe; to close, not to leave open, sources of future disagreement, which time might multiply and aggravate. That, with this view, and setting aside the discordant principles of the two Governments, in the hope of promoting it, they had to propose, first, that the third article of the Convention of October, 1818, should now be considered as at an end. Secondly, that, instead of it, the boundary line between the territories respectively claimed by the two Powers, westward of the Rocky Mountain, should be drawn due west, along the 49th parallel of latitude, to *the point where it strikes the northeasternmost branch of the Columbia, and thence, down, along the middle of the Columbia, to the Pacific ocean;* the navigation of this river to be forever free to the subjects and citizens of both nations: And further, that the subjects or citizens of either, should not, in future, be allowed to form settlements within the limits to be thus assigned to the other, with a saving in favor of settlements already formed within the prohibited limits; the proprietors

or occupants of which, on both sides, should be allowed to remain ten years longer.

This proposal they annexed, in form, (marked P,) to the protocol of the twenty-third Conference. They remarked, that, in submitting it, they considered Great Britain as departing largely from the full extent of her right; and that, if accepted by the United States, it would impose upon her the necessity, ultimately, of breaking up four or five settlements, formed by her subjects within the limits that would become prohibited, and that they had formed, under the belief of their full right, as British subjects, to settle there. But their Government was willing, they said, to make these surrenders, for so they considered them, in a spirit of compromise, on points where the two nations stood so divided.

I instantly declared to the British Plenipotentiaries my utter inability to accept such a boundary as they had proposed. I added, at the same time, that I knew how the spirit of just accommodation also animated the Government of the United States upon this occasion. That, in compliance with this spirit, and in order to meet Great Britain on ground that might be deemed middle, I would consent so far to vary the terms of my own proposal, annexed to the twelfth protocol, as to shift its *southern* line as low as 49, in place of 51. I desired it to be understood, that this was the extreme limit to which I was authorized to go, and that, in being willing to make this change, I too considered the United States as abating their rights, in the hope of being able to put an end to all conflict of claims between the two nations, to the coast and country in dispute.

The British Plenipotentiaries, after having this modification of my first proposal a fortnight under consideration, rejected it, and they made me no new proposal in return. They did not, in terms, enter their rejection of this, my second proposal, on the protocol, and I did not urge it; think-

ing that their abstinence, as far as it could have any effect, might tend to leave the door somewhat less permanently closed against reconsideration, should the proposal, as so modified by me, ever be again made. But it is right for me to state, that they more than once declared, at the closing hours of the negotiation, that the boundary marked out in their own written proposal, was one from which the Government of the United States must not expect Great Britain to depart.*

I have to add, that their proposal was first made to me verbally, at the twentieth conference, and that it then embraced an alternative of leaving the third article of the Convention of 1818, to its natural course and limit. But this they afterwards controlled, by their more formal and final proposition in writing, annexed, as before described, to the protocol of the twenty-third conference.

Having made you acquainted with all that transpired on this subject, I close it, by referring to the protocols in which it is mentioned. These are, the eleventh, the twelfth, the nineteenth, the twentieth, and the twenty-third.

I have now gone through all the subjects, and feel it time to come to a conclusion. I have made no omissions that are material, of which, at present, I have any consciousness. If, on reviewing, at full leisure, the private journals from

* In a subsequent negotiation in 1827, Britain agreed to yield to the United States north of the Columbia, a *detached territory*, as Mr. Greenhow, in his valuable work on the "History of Oregon and California," quotes it from the official document, extending on the Pacific and the Strait of Fuca, from Bulfinch's Harbor to Hood's Canal; but adhered to her claim to the northern bank of the Columbia, and her coequal right to the free navigation of that river. I am uninformed of the existing state of the negotiations between the two Governments; but by no published document of which I have knowledge, has the British Government yet departed in any greater degree from the ground laid down in the twentieth and twenty-third protocols of the above negotiation which I conducted in 1824.

which I have selected the materials of this official dispatch, I discover omissions, I will take care that they shall be supplied by a supplemental communication. I have laid before you a faithful, I would hope an intelligible, account of the progress, the character, and the results, of the whole negotiation. The importance, to use the appropriate words of your own dispatch to me of the 29th of July 1823, of most of its subjects, the complicated character of the considerations involved in them, and their momentous bearings in present and future ages upon the interests, the welfare, and the honour of the United States, I have felt, deeply felt, throughout the protracted period allotted to their investigation and discussion. A load of responsibility and solicitude has weighed unceasingly upon my mind. A just, I will add a painful, sense of the great duty that was confided to me, has never been absent from my thoughts. If it had been the pleasure of the President to have assigned me a colleague in its exercise, I should have felt thankful, having, as I took the liberty to say before it came on, entertained unfeigned distrust in my own unassisted endeavors. For a proper estimate of what was due from me, for zeal, for good intentions, for diligence, I must humbly hope that the confidence reposed in me, has not been misplaced. For the rest, I cannot answer. Now, that the negotiation is over, I cannot presume to hope, that the manner in which I have conducted it, under all the many aspects which it assumes, aspects unforeseen, and to me, often as difficult as unforeseen, will be deemed to have been always above exception. Constantly, as I looked to the guiding light of your instructions, and ample as was the light shed by them over my general path, there were, there must have been, in the progress of voluminous discussions, where not the just desires of one nation only, but the clashing interests of two, were at stake, points for which your instructions did not pro-

vide. Reposing upon all these occasions on their general spirit, I must seek solace in the consciousness, that however unsuccessful the issue of my endeavors, they were always well meant; and in the hope, that in their general character and tendency, they will be looked at with an indulgence proportioned to the anxious desire for my country's good, in which I feel sure it will be believed they ever originated. Of the questions which it fell to my lot to discuss with this nation, those that were old, were full of difficulty, and had proved baffling in hands more skilful than mine, in times that are passed. Of those that were new, some were of great magnitude, and found to be encompassed with difficulties not less formidable and intrinsic. Nor will it, I hope, be reputed out of place with my duty, or with the solemnity of this communication, to close it finally by the remark, that the negotiation, of which it has aimed at exhibiting an authentic history, has been conducted with a nation, not only mighty in her power, but not easily turned aside from her purposes. The deliberate determinations to which she appears for the present to have come in this negotiation, I have felt it an imperious duty to report, without, in any instance, abating the force of any of the considerations by which I understood her Plenipotentiaries to expound and maintain them.

I have the honor to remain,
Sir,
With very great respect,
Your obedient servant,
RICHARD RUSH

The Honorable
JOHN QUINCY ADAMS,
Secretary of State.

[The Protocols not inserted in the series that follow, were those which recorded the proceedings of the Plenipotentiaries in framing the Slave Trade Convention, and were transmitted to the Secretary of State with that Convention.]

Protocol of the third conference of the American and British Plenipotentiaries, held at the Board of Trade, February 5th, 1824.

PRESENT—Mr. Rush,
Mr. Huskisson,
Mr. Stratford Canning.

The protocol of the preceding conference was read over and signed.

In pursuance of previous agreement, Mr. Rush brought forward the propositions of his Government respecting the trade between the British colonies in North America and the West Indies, and the United States, including the navigation of the St. Lawrence, by vessels of the United States.

On concluding the statement with which Mr. Rush introduced these proposals, in explanation of the views and antecedent proceedings of his Government, he gave in the three articles which are hereunto annexed, (marked A.)

The British Plenipotentiaries, in receiving the articles thus presented to them for consideration, confined themselves to stating their first impressions as to the scope and extent of the American proposals, and the extreme difficulty resulting therefrom, observing on such parts of the American Plenipotentiary's statement as appeared to them to call for immediate objection, or to admit of satisfactory explanation.

Adjourned to Monday, the 16th instant, at 2 o'clock.

RICHARD RUSH,
W. HUSKISSON,
STRATFORD CANNING.

Protocol of the eighth conference of the American and British Plenipotentiaries, held at the Board of Trade, on the 18th of March, 1824.

PRESENT—Mr. Rush,
Mr. Huskisson,
Mr. Stratford Canning.

Another original copy of the Convention on the subject of the Slave Trade, having been prepared, at the request of the American Plenipotentiary, with the view of enabling him to transmit that instrument in duplicate to his Government, was read over, and upon its proving to be perfectly correct, was signed by the Plenipotentiaries on both sides.

RICHARD RUSH,
W. HUSKISSON,
STRATFORD CANNING.

Protocol of the ninth conference of the American and British Plenipotentiaries, held at the Board of Trade, on the 25th of March, 1824.

PRESENT—Mr. Rush,
Mr. Huskisson,
Mr. Stratford Canning.

The protocol of the preceding conference was read over and signed.

The British Plenipotentiaries stated, that not being yet at liberty, from circumstances already explained, to make a

full communication with respect to the three articles proposed by Mr. Rush at the third conference, while they were disposed, in the spirit of that perfect amity and good will which subsisted between the respective Governments, to treat of the free navigation of the river St. Lawrence by American vessels, on the principle of accomodation and mutual concession, they thought it desirable that the American Plenipotentiary should at once bring forward the proposals of his Government, on the several questions already submitted by him for negotiation.

The American Plenipotentiary readily acquiesced in the expediency of this course, on the obvious understanding that the views of the British Government would be in turn communicated to him. He consequently gave in the paper D, annexed hereto, as containing the proposal of his Government for endeavouring to adjust, by compromise, the differences arising under the 5th article of the treaty of Ghent.

Mr. Rush remarked, at the same time, on the extreme difficulties attending an arbitration, as prescribed by that treaty; and stated his conviction, that his Majesty's late Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had signified to him the assent of the British Government, to his proposal of endeavoring to settle the points at issue by direct communication between the two Governments.

In reply to a question from the British Plenipotentiaries, Mr. Rush informed them that he was not prepared, in case of his proposal being finally accepted, to submit any particular terms of compromise for settling the disputed boundary, though he was persuaded that his Government in proposing a negotiation upon that principle, looked with confidence to its issuing in an agreement satisfactory to both parties; and, also, that, in the event of an arbitration being insisted on, his present instructions would enable him to proceed at

once to the concurrent selection of an arbitrator, agreeably to the treaty of Ghent.

It was agreed that the next conference should be held on Monday next, the 29th instant, when the American Plenipotentiary would be prepared to continue his communication of the proposals of his Government.

RICHARD RUSH,
W. HUSKISSON,
STRATFORD CANNING.

Protocol of the tenth conference of the American and British Plenipotentiaries, held at the Board of Trade on the 29th of March, 1824.

PRESENT—Mr. Rush,
Mr. Huskisson,
Mr. Stratford Canning.

The protocol of the preceding conference was read over and signed.

The American Plenipotentiary entered upon the subject of the Newfoundland Fishery. He stated, at length, the circumstances constituting the case which his Government thought it advisable to bring under the view of the British Government, and concluded by giving in, as a memorandum of his statement, the paper marked E, annexed to the present protocol.

The British Plenipotentiaries, after making such inquiries of Mr. Rush, as they deemed conducive to a thorough understanding of the points in question, agreed to meet him again in conference, on Thursday, the 1st of April.

RICHARD RUSH,
W. HUSKISSON,
STRATFORD CANNING.

Protocol of the eleventh conference of the American and British Plenipotentiaries, held at the Board of Trade, on the 1st of April, 1824.

PRESENT—Mr. Rush,
Mr. Huskisson,
Mr. Stratford Canning.

The protocol of the preceding conference was read over, and signed.

The American Plenipotentiary opened the subject of territorial claims on the Northwest Coast of America westward of the Rocky Mountains. It having been understood that the pretension which had been put forward by the Cabinet of St. Petersburg, respecting its jurisdiction in that quarter, was to be a matter of separate discussion between the respective parties, he observed, that, notwithstanding this circumstance, and although the Convention of October, 1818, one article of which, contained a temporary regulation with respect to the above mentioned claims, had still four years to continue, his Government was of opinion that the present was not an unsuitable moment for attempting a settlement of the boundary on the Northwest Coast of America westward of the Rocky Mountains, and he therefore proceeded to explain the nature of the claims which his Government thought itself entitled to advance.

His statement not being completed in the present conference, Mr. Rush undertook to resume it on the following day.

RICHARD RUSH,
W. HUSKISSON,
STRATFORD CANNING.

Protocol of the twelfth conference of the American and British Plenipotentiaries, held at the Board of Trade, on the 2d of April, 1824.

PRESENT—Mr. Rush,
Mr. Huskisson,
Mr. Stratford Canning.

The protocol of the preceding conference was read over and signed.

The American Plenipotentiary resumed the communication which he had commenced in that conference, on the subject of the territorial claims on the Northwest Coast of America, westward of the Rocky Mountains, and concluded, by giving in the paper marked F, annexed hereto, as containing the proposal of his Government on that head.

Adjourned to Monday the 5th of April.

RICHARD RUSH,
W. HUSKISSON,
STRATFORD CANNING.

Protocol of the thirteenth conference of the American and British Plenipotentiaries, held at the Board of Trade on the 5th of April, 1824.

PRESENT—Mr. Rush,
Mr. Huskisson,
Mr. Stratford Canning.

The protocol of the preceding conference was read over and signed.

The American Plenipotentiary stated that, in addition to the questions submitted for negotiation at the preceding conferences, he was instructed to treat with Great Britain

on various subjects of maritime law, heretofore in discussion between the two countries; and, also, on that of the abolition of privateering, and the exemption from all capture of private property in merchant ships at sea. Amongst the former subjects, he mentioned that of impressment as of leading importance.

He added that, as he was not authorized to assent to any thing new in principle, on such of these points as had been discussed on former occasions, it was right for him to premise that, unless the British Government were ready to negotiate with the understanding that the views, which they had heretofore entertained on them, were essentially changed, or likely, in the course of negotiation, to be materially modified, the Government of the United States would prefer, on the whole, not bringing these questions under discussion at the present time.

After stating the general political considerations which had induced his Government to make this overture, he informed the British Plenipotentiaries, in reply to an inquiry on their part, that, although he was willing to treat of impressment alone, he should not feel inclined to enter on the other points of maritime law, unless the question of impressment were, at the same time, received by his majesty's ministers, as part of that negotiation.

The British Plenipotentiaries having further asked whether any additional securities would be proposed or admitted by the American Government, against the employment of British natural born subjects in the merchant vessels of the United States, the American Plenipotentiary replied that he had none to offer, essentially differing from those brought forward in former negotiations.

Richard Rush,
W. Huskisson,
Stratford Canning.

Protocol of the fourteenth conference of the American and British Plenipotentiaries, held at the Board of Trade, on the 13th of April, 1824.

PRESENT.—Mr. Rush,
Mr. Huskisson,
Mr. Stratford Canning.

After the protocol of the preceding conference had been agreed to and signed, the British Plenipotentiaries stated that they had invited Mr. Rush to an interview, in order to inform him, that, in consequence of the inquiries which they had made, as to the right of fishing on the western coast of Newfoundland, they conceived that the case, as previously described by him, was hardly of a nature to be entertained among the subjects of the present negotiation.

The citizens of the United States were clearly entitled, under the Convention of October, 1818, to a participation with His Majesty's subjects, in certain fishing liberties on the coasts of Newfoundland: the Government of the United States might, therefore, require a declaration of the extent of those liberties, as enjoyed by British subjects, under any limitations prescribed by treaty with other powers, and protection in the exercise of the liberties so limited, in common with British subjects, within the jurisdiction of His Majesty, as sovereign of the island of Newfoundland; and that such declaration and protection, if necessary, might be applied for in the regular diplomatic course; but that it was to be observed, that the question appeared to have been in some degree varied; first, by the line of argument pursued in the correspondence between Mr. Gallatin and Viscount Chateau-

briand, the latter having rested his claim to the right of excluding the United States from the fisheries on those parts of the coast of Newfoundland, to which the above mentioned correspondence applied, upon engagements contracted by the American Government towards that of France, long before October, 1818: according to his construction of which engagements, the United States had virtually rendered their exercise of the liberty of fishing between Cape Ray and the Quirpon Islands, conceded by Great Britain, dependent on the compliance of His Most Christian Majesty; and, secondly, by the consent of the American Government, to open discussions on this subject, at Washington, with the French Chargé d'Affaires.

The American Plenipotentiary protesting wholly against the grounds assumed by France, as impairing in any degree the fishing rights of the United States, held under the Convention of October the 20th, 1818, and not admitting that any correspondence which had taken place between the Governments of the United States and France upon this subject, could affect any of those rights, remarked, that his main object being to bring the question which had arisen between the United Sates and France fully under the notice of the Government of His Britannic Majesty, with a view to the objects stated in his paper marked E, (annexed to the protocol of the 10th conference,) he should adopt the course of addressing an official representation upon the whole subject to His Majesty's principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

Richard Rush.
W. Huskisson.
Stratford Canning.

Protocol of the fifteenth conference of the American and British Plenipotentiaries, held at the Board of Trade, on the 4th of June, 1824.

PRESENT.—Mr. Rush,
Mr. Huskisson,
Mr. Stratford Canning.

The protocol of the preceding conference was read over and signed.

The British Plenipotentiaries stated, that, having received the instructions of their Government on the various important and extensive questions submitted for negotiation, they were now prepared to communicate fully and definitively thereon with the American Plenipotentiary.

Beginning with the articles of colonial intercourse, proposed by him at the third conference, they explained at large the sentiments of their Government, showing what insuperable objections, alike in principle as in practice, precluded Great Britain, in their estimation, from acceding to the articles in question, except with the omission of such parts as stipulated, in reference to that intercourse, for a complete assimilation of the duties on imports from the United States into the colonies, to those levied on like imported articles, the produce of His Britanic Majesty's possessions.

The American Plenipotentiary stated, that he was not authorized to sign the proposed articles, without a full stipulation to the preceding effect; but that he was instructed to invite the British Plenipotentiaries, in case of the terms which he had offered not being accepted, to bring forward counter proposals, which he should be ready to transmit,

together with any explanations, for consideration, to his Government.

Adjourned to Tuesday, the 8th instant.

RICHARD RUSH,
W. HUSKISSON,
STRATFORD CANNING.

Protocol of the sixteenth conference of the American and British Plenipotentiaries, held at the Board of Trade, on the 8th of June, 1824.

PRESENT—Mr. Rush,
Mr. Huskisson,
Mr. Stratford Canning.

The protocol of the preceding conference was read over and signed.

The British Plenipotentiaries, after further discussion in relation to commercial intercourse between the United States and certain of the British colonies, gave in the annexed counter projet on that subject, in reference to what had passed at the preceding conference, observing, at the same time, that the first two articles of the proposal communicated by the American Plenipotentiary in their third conference with him, had, in their opinion, no necessary connection with the third, relating to the navigation of the river St. Lawrence, and, that they conceived it would be more convenient to treat of them separately.

Adjourned to Tuesday, the 15th instant.

RICHARD RUSH,
W. HUSKISSON,
STRATFORD CANNING.

Protocol of the seventeenth conference of the American and British Plenipotentiaries, held at the Board of Trade, on the 15*th of June*, 1824.

PRESENT—Mr. Rush,
Mr. Huskisson,
Mr. Stratford Canning.

The protocol of the preceding conference was read over and signed.

The British Plenipotentiaries stated, that, in pursuance of the proposals of the American Government, they were ready to enter into stipulations for settling, by compromise, the several questions which had arisen under the fifth article of the treaty of Ghent; and that, agreeably to the disposition which they had expressed in a former conference, to treat of the navigation of the river St. Lawrence by vessels of the United States, on principles of accommodation and mutual concession, they now proposed to negotiate on that subject in connection with the said questions which affect the boundary of the British and American territories, throughout the region contiguous to that part of the St. Lawrence which flows exclusively through His Majsty's dominions. They intimated, at the same time, that the course which they proposed in this manner to pursue, was founded on the understanding, that the navigation of the St. Lawrence, throughout his Majesty's territories, was not to be claimed by the United States as a right; and this intimation they accompanied with an exposition of the very decided opinion entertained by their Government against such an absolute, independent claim.

The American Plenipotentiary said, that he was not able

to go into the proposed negotiation, as relating to the St. Lawrence, on the principle of concession, but, on the contrary, that his instructions imposed upon him the obligation of pressing the claim of the United States to the entire navigation of that river, expressly on the ground of independent right, and that he conceived it would be his duty, in asserting that claim, to enter it so grounded on the protocol of the conferences.

It was agreed, however, that it would be convenient, on the whole, to postpone any decided step thereupon until the ensuing conference.

Adjourned.

RICHARD RUSH,
W. HUSKISSON,
STRATFORD CANNING.

Protocol of the eighteenth conference of the American and British Plenipotentiaries, held at the Board of Trade, on the 19*th of June,* 1824.

PRESENT—Mr. Rush,
Mr. Huskisson,
Mr. Stratford Canning.

The protocol of the preceding conference was read over and signed.

The American Plenipotentiary, referring to that conference, stated, that he felt himself bound to present the claim of the United States to a concurrent enjoyment of the navigation of the river St. Lawrence, from its source to the sea, on the express ground of independent right. He said that he had indeed been at liberty to exercise his judgment as

to the time and manner of presenting that claim: but he was positively instructed to urge it, in the course of the negotiations, in the above decided sense of right; that otherwise he should have been obliged to prefer the same claim by direct application to the foreign department. It was in discharge of the duty thus imposed upon him, that he gave in the annexed paper marked B, containing a distinct exposition of the views and principles on which the above-mentioned claim of the American Government was sustained.

The British Plenipotentiaries, on receiving this declaration and written argument from Mr. Rush, observed, that it became their duty to deny, and they did therefore deny, in explicit terms, the right so claimed on behalf of the United States to navigate, in common with British subjects, that part of the river St. Lawrence which flows exclusively through His Majesty's territories; they added, that they could not conceal the surprise which they felt at learning that such a right was to be asserted by the American Government, especially as it must necessarily have the effect of tying up their hands with respect to the instructions which they had received from their Government on a very different apprehension of the subject, and which they had no hesitation in describing as founded on a most liberal and comprehensive view of the wishes and interests of the United States, with respect to the disputed points of the boundary line under the fifth article of the treaty of Ghent, no less than as touching the navigation of the St. Lawrence, which they had considered, on the principle of accommodation and mutual concession, as supplying additional means for the satisfactory adjustment of those disputed points, by negotiation and compromise.

The American Plenipotentiary, in supporting the claim of his Government, averred that it was not put forward in any

unfriendly spirit, but with reference to such of the national interests as were immediately concerned in the question, and that it was subject, of course, to the operation of further discussion between the two Governments, and a frank communication of their respective sentiments.

Adjourned.

RICHARD RUSH,
W. HUSKISSON,
STRATFORD CANNING.

Protocol of the nineteenth conference of the American and British Plenipotentiaries, held at the Board of Trade, on the 26th of June, 1824.

PRESENT—Mr. Rush,
Mr. Huskisson,
Mr. Stratford Canning.

The protocol of the preceding conference was read over and signed.

The British Plenipotentiaries stated, that, having considered the declaration made by Mr. Rush in that conference, concerning the independent right of the United States to the entire navigation of the river St. Lawrence, and the written argument which he had annexed to the protocol in support of that right, they felt themselves called upon to communicate in a manner equally explicit and formal, the ground on which their Government denied a right of the description asserted on the part of the United States. They added, that, although the opinions which they had already declared on that point were unchanged, they thought it due to the gravity and importance of the question, not to give in their

reply to the American argument until it had received the full sanction of the highest professional authorities in the country, on matters relating to the law of nations. For the accomplishment of this object, an interval of some days was obviously requisite and therefore, to delay as little as possible the progress of the negotiations, they proposed to pass on for the present to the questions of boundary on the Northwest coast of America.

The American Plenipotentiary said, that any delay, as to the question of the St. Lawrence, did not, in his opinion, affect the points to be adjusted under the fifth article of the treaty of Ghent, and that he desired to proceed at once to the conclusion of an agreement by which those points should be referred to a direct negotiation between the two Governments, as before proposed by him. But, as it appeared, on discussing these matters, that Mr. Rush was authorized only to take *ad referendum* any counter proposals of the British Government on the abovementioned points, (whether those counter proposals conveyed any positive terms of compromise or only such arrangements as the British Plenipotentiaries conceived must necessarily accompany the mere agreement to settle the points at issue by compromise,) and that his instructions would not allow of his *concluding* any thing at present with the British Plenipotentiaries as to the various preparatory steps indispensable for carrying the disputed points of the fifth article of the treaty of Ghent before an arbitrator, if arbitration should be found after all to be inevitable—it was finally agreed that the Plenipotentiaries should meet again on the 29th instant in order to communicate definitively on the subject of the Northwest boundary.

Adjourned.

Richard Rush,
W. Huskisson,
Stratford Canning.

Protocol of the twentieth conference of the American and British Plenipotentiaries, held at the Board of Trade, on the 29th of June, 1824.

PRESENT—Mr. Rush,
Mr. Huskisson,
Mr. Stratford Canning.

The protocol of the preceding conference was read over and signed.

The British Plenipotentiaries stated and explained at length the sentiments of their Government, with respect to the conflicting claims of Great Britain and the United States to the territories in North America, lying between the Rocky Mountains and the Pacific Ocean. They declined the proposal made on this subject by the American Plenipotentiary, and annexed to the 12th protocol, because it would substantially have the effect of limiting the claims of their Government to a degree inconsistent, as they thought, with the credit and just interests of the nation. After much discussion and mutual explanation of the claims on each side, when taken in their full extent, it was agreed that, following the example given by the American Plenipotentiary in his proposal, it would be advisable to attempt a settlement on terms of mutual convenience, setting aside for that purpose the discordant principles on which the respective claims were founded. Whereupon, the British Plenipotentiaries stated, in general terms, that they were ready, either to agree on a boundary line, to be drawn due west from the Rocky Mountains, along the 49th parallel of latitude, to the northeasternmost branch of the Columbia or Oregon River, and thence, down the middle of that river, to the ocean, or

to leave the 3d article of the Convention of 1818 to its natural course. The American Plenipotentiary, in remarking upon this boundary, declared his utter inability to accede to it; but finding that the line offered in his former proposal was considered wholly inadmissible by the British Plenipotentiaries, said, that, in the hope of adjusting the question, he would so far vary his former line *to the south*, as to consent that it should be the 49th instead of the 51st degree of north latitude.

In the course of the conference, the American Plenipotentiary stated, that he was instructed to insist on the principle that no part of the American continent was henceforward to be open to colonization from Europe. To explain this principle, he stated that the independence of the late Spanish Provinces precluded any new settlement within the limits of their respective jurisdictions; that the United States claimed the exclusive sovereignty of all the territory within the parallels of latitude which include as well the mouth of the Columbia, as the heads of that river, and of all its tributary streams; and that, with respect to the whole of the remainder of that continent not actually occupied, the Powers of Europe were debarred from making new settlements, by the claim of the United States, as derived under their title from Spain.

The British Plenipotentiaries asserted, in utter denial of the above principle, that they considered the unoccupied parts of America just as much open as heretofore to colonization by Great Britain, as well as by other European Powers, agreeably to the Convention of 1790, between the British and Spanish Governments, and that the United States would have no right whatever to take umbrage at the establishment of new colonies from Europe in any such parts of the American continent.

The British Plenipotentiaries added, that they felt them-

selves more particularly called upon to express their distinct denial of the principle and claims thus set forth by the American Plenipotentiary, as his claim respecting the territory watered by the River Columbia and its tributary streams, besides being essentially objectionable in its general bearing, had the effect of interfering directly with the actual rights of Great Britain, derived from use, occupancy, and settlement.

RICHARD RUSH,
W. HUSKISSON,
STRATFORD CANNING.

Protocol of the twenty-first conference of the American and British Plenipotentiaries, held at the Board of Trade, on the 3d of July, 1824.

PRESENT—Mr. Rush,
Mr. Huskisson,
Mr. Stratford Canning.

The protocol of the preceding conference was read over and signed.

The questions of maritime law were taken up. The British Plenipotentiaries stated, with reference to Mr. Rush's communication on this head, as recorded in the protocol of the 13th conference, that the sentiments of their Government, respecting the impressment of British seamen in time of war, were unchanged; and that, however anxious they were to reconcile the eventual exercise of that right on the high seas with the convenience and feelings of other nations, they could not, consistently with their duty, agree to wave it, with respect to the vessels of the United States, except on

receiving a full and efficient security, that the end for which it was occasionally resorted to should be substantially attained by other satisfactory means. That, having been informed by the American Plenipotentiary that he had to propose no measures for effecting this important object essentially differing from those which, in former negotiations, had been found inadequate, they could not but concur with him in the opinion, that any discussion of the question, at the present moment of general tranquillity, would be altogether unadvisable.

With regard to the other maritime questions affecting the relations of neutral and belligerant powers, the British Plenipotentiaries observed, that, as the American Plenipotentiary was not prepared to enter into stipulations respecting them, except in conjunction with the subject of impressment, which subject was not to be entered into, for the reasons above stated, the discussion of these questions, under the present circumstances, would, obviously, be attended with no practical utility.

They expressed themselves willing, at the same time, to treat on other points, not falling under this head, but connected with the improvement of friendly intercourse and good neighborhood, already subsisting between the two countries, if the American Plenipotentiary felt himself at liberty to entertain proposals founded on this principle.

The American Plenipotentiary expressed his readiness to receive and transmit to his Government any suggestions of this description; but stated that he was not prepared to propose or definitely accept any stipulations of such a nature, except in conjunction with an arrangement as to the maritime questions. Adjourned.

Richard Rush,
W. Huskisson,
Stratford Canning.

Protocol of the twenty-second conference of the American and British Plenipotentiaries, held at the Board of Trade, on the 9th of July, 1824.

PRESENT.—Mr. Rush,
Mr. Huskisson,
Mr. Stratford Canning.

The protocol of the preceding conference was read over, and, afer some discussion, signed.

The American Plenipotentiary stated that the question of abolishing private war, and all capture of private property at sea, was considered by him as standing apart from the other questions of maritime law, which had been heretofore discussed between the two Governments, inasmuch as it was perfectly new, and had been proposed by his Government to other European Powers, as well as to Great Britain; and he wished it to be understood that he was ready to treat on that question alone, notwithstanding the decision already taken upon the other questions of maritime war.

The British Plenipotentiaries said, in reply to this statement, that, under the circumstances which prevented any present discussion of the questions of maritime law, discussed in former negotiations, there would be manifest inconvenience in now going into a question of the same class, which, besides being totally new as an object of discussion, involved the most extensive change in the principles and practice of maritime war, as hitherto sanctioned by the usage of all nations.

The British Plenipotentiaries, adverting to the other points not falling under the head of maritime law, but connected with the improvement of friendly intercourse and good neighborhood between the two nations, on which, in

the preceding conference, they had offered to treat independently, communicated the substance of nine articles, which they had been prepared to give in, if the American Plenipotentiary had felt himself at liberty to conclude an arrangement on them, and on which they declared themselves still ready to enter into stipulations with the Government of the United States.

RICHARD RUSH,
W. HUSKISSON,
STRATFORD CANNING.

Protocol of the twenty-third conference of the American and British Plenipotentiaries, held at the Board of Trade, on the 13th of July, 1824.

PRESENT—Mr. Rush,
Mr. Huskisson,
Mr. Stratford Canning.

The protocol of the preceding conference was read over and signed.

The British Plenipotentiaries, in more complete explanation of the statement made by them, in the twentieth conference, gave in an article, comprising the counter-proposals of their Government, as to the Northwest Boundary, in America, from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Ocean. They observed, at the same time, that, if their article were accepted, in substance, by the American Government, it would be necessary on framing it into a convention, to give its details and accompanying arrangements a more distinct and expanded shape. They added, that, in making the

annexed proposal, they had departed considerably from the full extent of the British right, agreeably to the readiness which they had before expressed, to settle the Northwest Boundary on grounds of fair compromise and mutual accommodation.

The American Plenipotentiary, in receiving the above article from the British Plenipotentiaries, remarked, that he wished it also to be understood, that, in proposing a modification of the article originally submitted by him, on this subject, he had been governed by the same view.

The American Plenipotentiary introduced the question of allowing United States Consuls to reside in the British Colonial Ports, and requested to be made acquainted with the sentiments of the British Government thereon.

The British Plenipotentiaries referred, in reply to the counter proposals which they had already given in, on the subject of colonial intercourse; of which proposals, the reception of American Consuls formed a distinct part.

Mr. Rush observed that, the residence of foreign Consuls, in any country, did not appear so much to depend on any particular set of commercial regulations, as to belong essentially to trade, under whatever form it might be carried on; and he supported this observation, by arguments connected with the protection of merchants trading under any lawful circumstances with a foreign country.

The British Plenipotentiaries agreed to take this suggestion into consideration before the next conference.

Adjourned.

Richard Rush,
W. Huskisson,
Stratford Canning.

Protocol of the twenty-fourth conference of the American and British Plenipotentiaries, held at the Board of Trade, on the 19th of July, 1824.

PRESENT—Mr. Rush,
Mr. Huskisson,
Mr. Stratford Canning.

The protocol of the preceding conference was read over and signed.

The British Plenipotentiaries gave in the annexed paper, in reply to the argument relating to the free navigation of the river St. Lawrence, given in by the American Plenipotentiary at a preceding conference, and, in like manner, annexed by him to the protocol.

The British Plenipotentiaries, referring to what had passed at the preceding conference, on the subject of receiving United States Consuls in His Majesty's open colonial ports, stated, that, although they saw no objection to the admission, into those colonies, of foreign Consuls, subject to the usual exceptions and reservations, while foreign vessels were in the practice of carrying on a lawful trade with the colonial ports, they conceived that there would be inconvenience in actually recognizing such appointments there, so long as it was uncertain, not only whether the proposals which they had given in on the subject of colonial intercourse, would be accepted by the American Government, but even whether the trade now carried on between the United States and His Majesty's colonies, would not be so clogged with additional burthens as to lead to its total interruption.

Adjourned.

RICHARD RUSH,
W. HUSKISSON,
STRATFORD CANNING.

Protocol of the twenty-fifth conference of the American and British Plenipotentiaries, held at the Board of Trade, on the 22d of July, 1824.

PRESENT—Mr. Rush,
Mr. Huskisson,
Mr. Stratford Canning.

The Protocol of the preceding conference was read over and signed.

The American Plenipotentiary, referring to the reply given in by the British Plenipotentiaries to his argument on the navigation of the river St. Lawrence, and annexed to the Protocol of the preceding conference, made observations tending, in his opinion, to sustain the view which he had before presented of that subject.

It was agreed, in consideration of the numerous and complicated questions on which the conferences had turned, that the Plenipotentiaries should meet again, and communicate with each other, prior to sending in to their respective Governments their final reports of the present state of the negotiations, suspended by the necessity of referring to Washington on some of the subjects that had been presented for discussion. Adjourned.

RICHARD RUSH,
W. HUSKISSON,
STRATFORD CANNING.

Protocol of the twenty-sixth conference of the American and British Plenipotentiaries, held at the Board of Trade, on the 28th of July, 1824.

PRESENT—Mr. Rush,
Mr. Huskisson,
Mr. Stratford Canning.

The protocol of the preceding conference was read over and signed.

The Plenipotentiaries, after communicating with each other in pursuance of the agreement taken at the preceding conference, and persuaded that they had sufficiently developed the sentiments of their respective Governments on the various subjects of their conferences, separated, under the circumstances which necessarily prevented for the present any further progress in the negotiations.

RICHARD RUSH,
W. HUSKISSON,
STRATFORD CANNING.

CHAPTER XXVI.

LEVEE AT CARLTON PALACE. INFORM MR. CANNING OF MY RECALL, AND ASK AN INTERVIEW WITH THE KING, A TIME FOR WHICH IS APPOINTED. THE MISSION CLOSES WITH AN AUDIENCE OF LEAVE OF THE KING.

1825. *April* 20. The official matter comprised in the dispatch set forth in the preceding chapter, needs at this day no commentary at my hands, and might be out of place coming from me. I leave it, therefore, in connexion with the authentic protocols subjoined, for whatever of information the whole may impart, or reflections it may suggest, to the general reader. The simple remark I will make is, that, so far as the Oregon question is concerned, the field, in my opinion, is still ample, and with a choice of modes, for settling that dispute, without any sacrifice of the honor or interests of either the United States or Great Britain.

The great purpose of this work having been ful-

filled, I pass over all intermediate matter occurring after the date of the dispatch, so fully published, to bring the work to a conclusion.

Under the above date (April 20,) I attended the levee at Carlton Palace, and gave Mr. Canning information of my recall, having been invited home by President Adams, to preside over the Treasury Department at Washington. I asked, when I might hope for the honor of a special audience of the King to deliver my letter of recall, and take leave of His Majesty. He appointed the twenty-seventh instant.

Mr. Canning congratulated me in friendly terms on the home trust to which I was called, and proposed that we should correspond after I returned to the United States; to which I was happy to assent.

I had half an hour's conversation with Sir John Copley,* and the Bishop of London, on our late Presidential election. Both agreed, that its quiet termination, considering the number of candidates in the beginning, namely, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Adams, General Jackson, Mr. Clay, and Mr. Calhoun, spoke well for our constitution, and the political habits of the people.

April 27. Had my audience of leave of the King. I said, that having been called home by my Govern-

* A native of Boston—afterwards called to the peerage as Lord Chancellor Lyndhurst.

ment, I had the honor to deliver to His Majesty a letter from the President, mentioning his intention of recalling me; in delivering which I was charged by the President to say, how sincerely it was his desire to maintain in all respects the good understanding which had subsisted between the two countries, during the period I had resided at His Majesty's Court.

The King reciprocated fully and cordially the President's desire, and thought proper to add that he was sorry I was going away, though, having understood the cause, it was to be expected. He used other kind words. Lord Bathurst was present at the interview. I thanked His Majesty for the many tokens of kindness with which he had honored me during so long a residence at his Court. He inquired as to the time of my embarkation, probable duration of the voyage, health of my family, and so on; the conversation lasting about fifteen minutes, when the interview closed.

THE END.

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED

LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below, or on the date to which renewed.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

REC'D LD
MAR 10 1961
24Apr'63JP
REC'D LD
APR 10 1963
MAR 14 2005

LD 21A–50*m*-12,'60
(B6221s10)476B

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

LD 21–20*m*-5,'39 (9269s)

E340
R8A33
64868